REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 177 JC 670 130

JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY--ISSUES AND PROBLEMS, A PRELIMINARY NATIONAL APPRAISAL.

BY- GARRISON, ROGER H.
AMERICAN ASSN. OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, WASHINGTON,D.C.
PUB DATE 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.96 99P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *FACULTY, *FACULTY EVALUATION, FACULTY MOBILITY, FACULTY RECRUITMENT, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER MOTIVATION, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, *TEACHING CONDITIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DURING A 9-MONTH PERIOD, 20 COLLEGES OF VARIED SIZE, ORGANIZATIONAL BASES AND LOCATIONS WERE VISITED AND THE ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF 650-700 INSTRUCTORS WERE OBTAINED THROUGH INFORMAL INTERVIEWS. A PATTERN OF GENERAL RESPONSES DEVELOPING FROM THESE OBSERVATIONS RELATES TO FACULTY SELF-IMAGE, ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS, AND JOB SATISFACTION. MORE SPECIFIC AREAS OF CONCERN INCLUDE TIME-RELATED PRESSURES, THE NEED FOR INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FLEXIBILITY, AN IMPROVEMENT IN BOTH VERTICAL AND HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATION LINKAGE WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO PROFESSIONAL NEEDS, INCREASED ATTENTION TO DEVELOPING A PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ROLE TO PROMOTE REQUISITE SUPPORT, AND IMPROVEMENT OF PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE TEACHING. THE JUNIOR COLLEGE SETTING IS STUDENT-CENTERED RATHER THAN SUBJECT-CENTERED AND REQUIRES FRESH, INNOVATIVE THINKING AS WELL AS QUALITY IN TEACHING. A NATIONAL FACULTY ORGANIZATION IS NEEDED IN ORDER TO DEVELOP GUIDELINES AND TO IMPLEMENT PLANNING TO MEET THE EXPRESSED NEEDS, ESPECIALLY THOSE RELATING TO IMPROVED COMMUNICATION WITHIN SUBJECT FIELDS, AMONG ADMINISTRATORS, AND BETWEEN THE VARIOUS LEVELS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1315 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036, FOR $2.00. (AL)

CALIFORNIA
NEW YORK
TEXAS
USETTS

JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY: ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

ED012177

JC 670 130

JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY: ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

A Preliminary National Appraisal

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 21 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

By ROGER H. GARRISON

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Roger H. Garrison &
American Assn. of Jr. Colleges
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

American Association
of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Printed in U. S. A.

Price: $2.00

Copyright 1967

Contents

PAGE

A Note of Appreciation V

Introduction 1

The Study: PURPOSE AND METHOD 5

Section One: THE TEACHER AND THE SETTING IN WHICH HE WORKS 15

Section Two: BASIC ISSUES AND PROBLEMS AS DESCRIBED BY TEACHERS 29

Section Three: 1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION PROGRAMS
2. AN AGENDA OF BASIC QUESTIONS FOR COLLEGES 82

A Note of Appreciation

Among the key issues and problems dominant at this stage of the spectacular growth and development of the two-year collegiate institutions of the United States, none is more fundamentally important than the three cardinal ones affecting teaching: the need for more teachers, their adequate preparation, and improvement of the climate for junior college teaching careers. Improved teacher status, incentives, and other overall environmental factors certainly will bear upon future recruitment and training preparation and, indeed, must precede, in a sense, the securing of more and better teachers. An almost equally imposing task, as the present study reveals, will be the attainment of fuller opportunities for continuing in-service professional growth on the part of all junior college faculties.

In noting the impact of technology upon man's environment, Marshall McLuhan has written, "In our time the sudden shift from the mechanical technology of the wheel to the technology of electric circuitry represents one of the major shifts of all historical time." So, too, has the American people's commitment to bettered educational opportunity, coupled with the mid-century population surge, led to a quick and deep shift in the nation's historic educational structure, typified by the ascendance of the junior college.

The study of the two-year college faculty "climate" conditions, and the means of enhancing them, as Roger H. Garrison has so brilliantly herein set forth, doubtless will prove to be a landmark delineation and critical appraisal. The basic questions articulated and the action conclusions posed should command the forward attention of all working toward, or concerned with, the future of America's "people's colleges," soon to be, perhaps, the largest segment of higher education.

On behalf of the trustees and staff of United States Steel Foundation, Inc., it is my pleasure to record the sense of privilege experienced in being associated, from its inception, with Mr. Garrison's study and in providing the financial grant for its execution. It follows, of course, that the study content and the views expressed are those of the author; the Foundation did not participate in the content, procedures, or conclusions reached.

The basic idea for sponsorship of the study project arose in a conference of the Foundation's staff. There followed enthusiastic directional guidance conferences with Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., and his associates of the American Association of Junior Colleges which, in turn, led to the announcement by the Foundation trustees of the substantial grant required.

By coincidence, a second foundation proposed almost simultaneously to finance a related study to be undertaken by the American Association of Junior Colleges. The foundations and the Association worked out the desired boundaries for the two grants, thereby expanding the utility of both of them. This coincidence is cited solely to emphasize the wisdom of improved communication among all types of donors toward the end of discovery of the most effective utilization of all private philanthropic resources for research and resolution of the manifold problems of the junior colleges.

W. Homer Turner
Vice-President and Executive Director
United States Steel Foundation, Inc.

New York, New York
November 21, 1966

Introduction

The genesis of this study of current issues and problems affecting the faculty member in junior colleges was the long-standing recognition by the American Association of Junior Colleges of the need to have more specific knowledge of faculty concerns than has been available. The Association intended that the study would appraise in some depth these faculty concerns; and from the appraisal, find bases for specific action programs for the benefit of faculty on the national level as well as in individual junior colleges; and further, that the study would identify needed areas of research to be conducted by universities and/or under educational research provisions of existing federal enactments.

As the burgeoning junior college moves towards achieving its own special character within the framework of higher education, a range of unresolved issues continues to develop around the role of junior college faculty. There is, for example, the problem of a clear professional identity for those who teach in these institutions. And, with the rapid increase in both the number of colleges and the number of instructional personnel, the need to define these issues and problems becomes more acute. Accordingly, the Association proposed, as a practical first step, a sampling of representative faculty opinion in varied two-year colleges around the country. It was proposed that a qualified person conduct enough interviews with faculty that certain trends and common areas of concern could be pinpointed;

and that recommendations for further programs to assist faculty could be derived from this material. Such an approach was considered a positive beginning. The study was not designed to be a systematic appraisal-in-depth involving all junior colleges. This would have been a massive, long-term project, requiring extensive staff. Such a project was not felt to be necessary, especially since the kind of information to be sought was needed soon.

Primarily, the viewpoints of faculty members themselves were to be looked for in such areas as academic rank; the role of the faculty in institutional policy making; appropriate professional affiliations; the teacher's "image" of his status in higher education; junior college teaching as a permanent career; opportunities for research and professional advancement in subject-matter field; faculty views about preparation for junior college teaching and in-service programs; the rewards and frustrations of junior college teaching; and commitments to teaching students with a wide range of abilities. These, and other areas of concern, perhaps not perceived at the beginning of the study were, to the degree possible, to be discovered and, where possible, interpreted. Further, it was the Association's intention that the scope of the study should go well beyond simply identifying problems. The ultimate value of this study will lie in the development and application of its recommendations for specific programs directed toward resolution of the problems discovered.

Funds for this one-year study were provided by the United States Steel Foundation, Inc.

It was the Association's opinion that the basic qualifications of a person to direct this project should include: (1) no less than five years of teaching experience in a junior college; (2) administrative experience (other than the presidency) or major teaching position in a junior college; or the position of academic dean or dean of instruction; (3) evidence of writing proficiency and the capacity to organize; (4) evidence of demonstrated leadership ability and competence relating to junior college faculty matters, through published articles, professional activities, responsible positions in junior college faculty organizations, participation in summer institutes or workshops.

The project director selected was Roger H. Garrison, for fifteen years instructor and then chairman of the English Department at Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor, New York; and for four years following that, vice-president of that institution. Mr. Garrison is the author of two college textbooks: *A Creative Approach to Writing,* and *The Adventure of Learning in College.* He has written extensively on junior college faculty matters and has spoken to many faculty groups around the country. In 1965, he was the Danforth Foundation lecturer on education. Four years ago, he founded and directed a workshop for junior college teachers, now an annual event at Bennett College, Millbrook, New York. He is a member of the Committee on Teaching of the Association for Higher Education. Since 1961, he has taken an active part in the national convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

In designing and conducting this study, Mr. Garrison was advised by a project committee, with wide geographic representation, consisting of the president of a private, two-year, church-related institution; the president of a private liberal arts college; the dean of a public junior college; the president of a junior college district; a university professor directing a graduate program in junior college teacher internships; a state director of public community colleges; a faculty member from an independent junior college; and a faculty member from a public junior college.

Since the number of institutions which could be effectively visited by one person within an academic year was strictly limited, the Project Advisory Committee determined approximately a dozen general categories of institutions; and then, bearing in mind geographic distribution, institutional size and aims, the project director and the committee selected twenty-eight colleges; and subsequently refined the list to fourteen. (However, as the report indicates, visits were eventually made to twenty different institutions.)

The combined strength of American higher education lies clearly in its diversity. Among themselves, junior colleges demonstrate great variety of type, purposes, and programs. For this reason, it was advisable to approach this project on a "case study" basis. The small, but representative sample of junior colleges selected reflected the heterogeneity of the two-year institutions and the varied composition and situations of their faculties.

Something must be said about the differing social and educational values which characterize junior colleges in this country. The vastly expanding public two-year college is, by and large, committed to the premise that all students should have opportunity for education beyond high school. These colleges are increasingly known as "open-door," or comprehensive colleges, with emphasis on appropriate course placement and selective retention of students. The public two-year college is also increasingly committed to semiprofessional and technical education, believing that today's society holds opportunities for achievement in a vast number of occupations which do not require the traditional baccalaureate degree. Thus, alongside the traditional academic transfer courses of study, there are increasing numbers of programs in the technologies, allied medical fields, and business fields.

Moreover, the comprehensive public two-year colleges are sensitive and responsive to the needs, interests, and educational requirements of the communities in which they are located. This response, for example, frequently takes the form of continuing education for adults, the use of local industrial and business advisory councils, and civic, cultural, and artistic events for the general enrichment of community life. In a sense, therefore, the community college is as much a social movement as an educational enterprise, and is perhaps closer to realizing a concept of a "people's college" than any other institution in the United States.

Clearly, the central person in this enterprise is the individual teacher. The report, presented on these pages, is, in a sense, the voice of the junior college faculty member as he identifies his own current and future professional situation and expresses his views about the issues and problems facing him in the kinds of institutions in which he teaches.

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

The Study: PURPOSE AND METHOD

The essential mandate of this study was simple, clear — and challengingly inclusive. It was to identify some of the current issues and problems affecting the junior college faculty member as he plays his key role in the explosively expanding two-year colleges throughout the country. Such identification was to be made by asking teachers to speak frankly for themselves, naming and characterizing the problems as seen in their own personal - professional context. Few junior college teachers have a national perspective; but a nationwide sampling of their opinions, as it turned out, provided a striking pattern of near-unanimity in certain problem areas.

It is likely that in the coming decade, new two-year institutions will be added at the rate of about fifty a year to the already existent 815 colleges. Fifty new junior colleges were established in 1965 and another fifty in 1966. To staff these campuses, and to replace teachers who retire, drop out, or move to other employment, conservative estimates indicate a need for at least 100,000 additional instructors by 1975.

Further, each year, a larger percentage of junior colleges could be characterized as "youthful;" less than five years old; freshly organized and staffed; without the internal stabilities of custom, refined routines, and long-worked-for objectives. Yet at the same time, many of them, especially in urban areas, are faced with a sometimes staggering annual growth of student populations, with all of the concomitant pressures on facilities, curriculum, trained administrative personnel — and, of course, on teachers.

One instructor summarized the situation by wryly paraphrasing *Alice In Wonderland:* "It's taken me only two semesters of teaching here to feel that all of us are running like hell — to stay in the same place."

It was in the context of these, and many other realities that a preliminary investigative study of faculty needs and problems had been seen by the American Association of Junior Colleges as urgently needed. Historically and currently, the Association has been largely an administrator's group; probably necessarily so, since membership in the Association is primarily institutional. Hence, perceptions of faculty problems have been largely one-sided and imprecise. Except on a regional, or occasionally a state basis, the individual faculty member has lacked real opportunity to make known his own views on matters affecting his professional activity and his welfare. The primary aim of this study was to get the faculty member to speak for himself; to identify in his own words and in the matrix of his own working life, what he could see as his professional situation, and what factors were affecting it, both now and as these might develop in the future.

The basic research scheme of the study was, like its purpose, both simple and direct: to interview informally and confidentially enough teachers in representative colleges to find significant common denominators of response; to make some assessment of the meaning of these responses; and to make recommendations (so far as possible based on what faculty themselves stated) for specific programs of action directed toward the resolution of issues and problems identified.

In planning the method of the study, the project committee and the investigator had to determine (1) what could reasonably be accomplished by one man during the mid-September to mid-June academic year, and (2) to assure that the necessarily limited random sampling would, with some fidelity, represent the thinking of junior college faculty as a group. Accordingly, broadly general "types" of two-year institutions were identified (see list at the end of this chapter), and fourteen colleges were chosen to be visited for periods of at least a week, and with very large ones, ten days or two weeks. (Twenty colleges were eventually visited, for varying periods of time, by the end of the study.)

The following letter, describing the intent of the study, was sent to the presidents of the colleges selected:

> I am writing to ask the privilege of visiting your campus for a period of time during this coming academic year.
>
> The American Association of Junior Colleges is keenly interested in the nature and meaning of issues affecting the two-year college faculty member, especially at a time when the two-year colleges are growing so rapidly, and when many thousands more instructors must be recruited and oriented toward junior college teaching. Yet little is objectively known about what the junior college teacher, himself, identifies as his professional needs, problems and satisfactions.
>
> Accordingly, I have been asked during this coming year to visit a representative group of colleges across the country to talk with faculty and administrators and perhaps, on occasion, with student groups, to identify major areas of concern that could be called common denominators with faculty in all types of two-year institutions. Such areas might include, for example: the role of faculty in institutional policy making; academic rank; appropriate professional affiliations; faculty self-image as to their "status" in higher education; opportunities for professional growth on the job; faculty views of the basic kinds of academic and/or other preparation for teaching; commitment to teaching students with a wide range of abilities; and similar matters, some of which may not now be apparent. In all of this, the primary viewpoint considered will be that of the faculty member — how he sees the issues that affect him, and what he hopes and suggests may productively be done in relation to them.
>
> Let me assure you immediately that in no sense whatever would my visit and my observations be intended or designed to be an evaluation in any form of a single institution. Indeed, the Project Advisory Committee for this effort, as well as the officers of the American Association of Junior Colleges, have stated as basic policy that this study is to observe scrupulously the anonymity of all persons and of the individual institutions visited. Indeed, to do otherwise would be to destroy the professional validity of the study. I would hope, in fact, that you and your faculty — should you agree to my visit — would consider me as "researcher-in-residence," so to

> speak; and assume that any observations I might make, or any comments or discussions I might hear or be involved in, would automatically be considered confidential, and be held so. The purpose of this study is to try to put together the bits and pieces of an enormously complex mosaic, and not to identify or inadvertently magnify situations which may be purely local and temporary. This is a national study, albeit a preliminary one.
>
> In connection with this, I would ask that there be no publicity — off-campus, at least — about my visit. I would, of course, hope that you and your administrators would explain carefully to your faculty what it is that I am trying to do, and enlist their cooperation. For example, I would like to be free to talk to individual faculty; to faculty committees; to visit occasional classes; to observe extracurricular activities; and, in general, to be an unobtrusive questioner on your campus for the duration of my visit. Much of the value of this study will come from faculty willingness to be frank, open, and explicit about what they see as their basic professional problems and needs — knowing, at the same time, that both their institution, and they, themselves, will not in any way be identified, criticized, or evaluated.
>
> Finally, the whole aim behind this project is to try to determine somewhat more specifically than we are now able to do, what the junior college teacher wants, what he needs, and what — in terms of action, not further "study" — a national organization like the American Association of Junior Colleges can then do to respond to these needs.

In every case, the response to this letter was affirmative; and subsequent cooperation at every college was all that any researcher could have asked.

As preparation for each visit, I asked to be provided with a catalog, a faculty handbook, and any other documents pertinent to faculty interests. These I read thoroughly beforehand, as orientation to the particular institution's policies and practices relating to its teaching staff. My contact person on a campus was, usually, a dean. In every case, either he or the president had informed the faculty of the purposes of my forthcoming visit, and I found little difficulty in explaining to teachers whom I interviewed the reasons for my being on campus.

Working from a faculty list indicating office hours, subject taught, and the like, my daily practice was to select at random teachers in various departments and subject areas, department chairmen or division heads, and guidance personnel, and in informal talks (stemming from a list of basic questions), cover as much of the range of matters affecting faculty as possible. Conversations took place in offices, corridors, faculty lounges (over coffee), in small groups in cafeterias, and on several occasions in almost formal seminar arrangements. In the give-and-take, many matters were discussed with a frankness and fluency that, cumulatively, has been immensely valuable.

During these talks, I took no notes, having learned long ago as a reporter that notebooks stiffen and make self-conscious those being interviewed. But immediately after an interview, I jotted down summaries so that key statements would not be forgotten or misquoted. After a series of interviews, it was my practice to dictate a thorough summary (together with impressions and questions) of the substances of the accumulated talks. The dictated notes, nearly three hundred pages of them, are the raw material from which this report has been written.

Though an accurate account is not possible, I estimate that between September and June I interviewed between 650 and 700 individual teachers; spent a day with the deans of instruction of a whole state; had "seminar" question-answer sessions with faculties of two small colleges; and on other occasions was able to meet representative faculty of state junior college systems. Two faculties of small colleges took the trouble to create and circulate questionnaires, and in both cases, response was nearly 100 per cent.

At the outset of the study, certain strict limitations had to be recognized. Since junior colleges are widely diverse in type, purposes, and programs; and since the comprehensive two-year colleges are (or attempt to be) especially responsive to the needs, interests, and educational requirements of the communities in which they are located, the range of problems, "issues," and factors affecting the staffs of these colleges is very broad indeed, and could hardly be investigated thoroughly by a single investigator within a year. Therefore, all interviews and discussions focused on faculty interests and viewpoints only, with the persistent attempt to see administrative, social, community, and even political problems (as they impinged upon the individual college) through the eyes and perspective of the individual teacher.

Special note: I want most strongly to emphasize that what is reported in the body of this study are *faculty perceptions* of the problems and issues they see as affecting them as professionals. Obviously, many administrators would view these problems differently — if, in some cases, they saw them as "problems" at all. For example, one dean said bluntly, "All faculty complain about not having enough time; or having too heavy schedules. But give them more time, or lighten their load, and what do they often do? Moonlight, that's what." Even allowing for the tincture of cynicism in the dean's remark, *his* perception of a faculty problem is obviously 180 degrees from that reported here as a key problem identified by teachers.

Certain basic questions formed the general framework of each interview. More often than not, these questions led to others as teachers explored their implications. Some of the key questions were:

1. What do you identify, in an approximate order of priority, as your own major professional problems and/or needs?

2. What do you consider to be your "status" in higher education? How do you compare yourself to a teacher in a four-year institution, for example?

3. Are you making junior college teaching a permanent career? Why?

4. Do you feel that you have sufficient opportunities for your own professional growth?

5. What were the most effective academic and/or work experiences in your preparation for teaching? In view of your current experience, what elements were missing in your preparation?

6. What is your opinion of academic rank for junior college teachers?

7. What have you found to be your most appropriate and useful professional affiliations? Should junior college teachers have their own professional groups?

8. Do you have sufficient resources and facilities here at your college for your own study? Do you feel the need of in-service programs for faculty? What kinds should these be?

9. Is orientation of new faculty effectively done here at your college? If not, what do you suggest is needed?

10. What do you consider are, or perhaps should be the chief responsibilities and functions of your administrators in relation to faculty?

11. What, in your view, should be the role of a faculty member in policy making at this college?

12. What, if any, are your nonteaching duties; and are they integral to your responsibilities as an instructor?

13. What is your opinion of the "open-door" philosophy of admissions? How does this policy affect you as a teacher?

14. How do you evaluate effective teaching? What kind of evaluation is practiced here at your institution? What, if any, changes should be made in these practices — and why?

15. To what extent, and in what ways, should faculty counsel students? What is the relationship here between faculty and the formal counseling-guidance staff?

16. What kinds of programs, if developed nationally (National Science Foundation grants are an example) could be of most benefit to you? Describe briefly the kinds of programs you would like to see established.

17. What special kinds of problems of instruction do you identify as posed by the wide range of student abilities and backgrounds?

18. Could you identify some of the rewards, as well as the frustrations, of teaching at this level and in this kind of college?

Obviously, no single interview could, or did, explore all of these questions. The interviews were essentially nondirective and unstructured. The major effort was to encourage the faculty member to speak his mind freely and personally in response to questions. As the interviews accumulated, they became, in effect, separate bits of a complex mosaic, with gradually emerging patterns. These patterns — either unmistakably clear, or suggested in outline — are the section headings in the body of this report.

It is tempting to try to draw a profile of the "typical" junior college faculty member, for there are certain characteristics and attitudes that most of them seem to hold in common. Yet, as Oliver Wendell Holmes remarked, "No generalization is worth a damn — including this one;" and any generalized portrait would immediately be false to the extraordinary variety of talents and diversity of backgrounds of the teachers in these lively and heterogeneous institutions. Whatever profile may emerge from the following pages will be drawn by the teachers themselves. Unless otherwise indicated, all statements, assertions, and illustrations in this report have been made by one, by a dozen, even by hundreds of faculty. As interviewer-reporter, I persistently tried to keep myself, my own biases and preoccupations, my inevitable blind spots and ignorances, both out of the interviewing and out of this report. Where opinions or interpretations are my own, they are clearly stated as such. It is mainly in the concluding portion of the report, where specific recommendations are made, that I take the responsibility of formulating and pinpointing suggested programs of action that have seemed to derive clearly from faculty responses.

There is little here which will surprise veteran junior college teachers or administrators. Most of the problems and needs of faculty are familiar, though nonetheless pressing. But it is the persistence and often near-unanimity of faculty opinion in certain key areas that underscore the obvious need for the kinds of programs recommended later.

It was inherent in the nature and method of this investigation that its final report should be largely anecdotal and impressionistic. To have attempted to base the study on questionnaires, and other research apparatus, no matter how carefully and elaborately evolved, would clearly have required a considerable staff and much more time than the study was allotted.

However, extreme care was taken to assure the essential accuracy of quotations and illustrations. (Indeed, I would often restate, or read to, individual teachers, their comments as a check on their fidelity.) Where a single quotation or comment is reflective of the views of many, this has been indicated.

Special thanks go to those administrators of the colleges visited for their quick understanding of the intent of this study, and for their unvarying courtesy and cooperation. Most especially, however, appreciation is given to those hundreds of teachers who gave their time and thoughtful, frank responses to the questions posed to them. To the extent that this report may be useful to our junior colleges (and, in other ways, to four-year colleges and universities), these faculty are responsible. Where statements may be in error, or possibly misleading or distorted, these reflect my own lack of knowledge of local situations: One does not become an expert on an area's problems or even the problems of a single college faculty with a visit measured in days. And in no sense, either, was there any attempt or intention to "evaluate" any institution. This would have been presumptuous and would have destroyed the validity of the study.

Obviously, given the limitations of a study of this kind, more questions are raised or implied than are answered. Clearly, some of these questions have serious import for the future quality of junior college education. Others may be peripheral or temporary. Whatever the measure of their pertinence, they deserve the thoughful consideration of all those who are concerned with the development and maturity of the junior college in this country.

ROGER H. GARRISON
Project Director and Staff Associate
American Association of Junior Colleges

GENERAL CATEGORIES OF COLLEGES VISITED

(Subcategories are not listed)

1. A college in a large city system (one unit in a multiunit organization under one central administration)

2. A college in an urban area, with a broad community college concept and programs

3. A multicampus district, with already-planned additional campuses.

4. A private, church-related college

5. A rapidly growing college in an essentially nonurban area

6. A technical college or institute

7. A nonurban college, with administrative organization still a part of the public school system

8. A college moving with difficulty toward establishment of greater local control, separate board of trustees, and greater local financial support

9. A two-year, independent college for women.

10. A rapidly growing public college, one of a state system, with state board and local advisory committees

11. An independent college moving toward public support.

12. A coeducational, largely residential college

Section One: 1

THE TEACHER AND THE SETTING IN WHICH HE WORKS

The Junior College Teacher — AS A PERMANENT CAREER

In the course of hundreds of interviews and discussions on twenty varied campuses over a period of nearly ten months, the impression (indeed, the conviction) deepened that the junior college teacher is — or may be becoming — a new breed of instructor in higher education. Markedly different in significant ways from the usual situation of his four-year colleagues are his conditions of instruction, his aims, and his professional-philosophical attitudes toward his task. Not simply a post-high-school instructor of grades thirteen and fourteen, he is, in his own desire and view, a colleague in a *new* kind of collegiate effort, as yet ill-defined and in furious flux. He is unsure of his status in the educational spectrum, for he fits few traditional categories. He is aware that he is being asked to function professionally in an unprecedented situation, and he is deeply concerned about this professionalism, in the best sense of that term. He is the servant of several demanding masters, and he is groping to bring such demands into a compatibility, a coherence, that will give his work a clear rationale and thrust that will command his loyalty and his long-range commitment.

His situation in the public colleges is unprecedented, in part, because he is being asked to implement a policy he had no part in formulating: namely, the "open-door," or "after-high-school-education-for-everyone-who-wants-it." Indeed, by now, this is less a policy than it is a national aspiration and expectation. The consequence, of course, is that neither the faculty member nor his institution has much effective screening control over students admitted to the colleges. "All kinds" come to the junior colleges, and the teacher's mandate is to instruct "all kinds," and at a level reputable enough to be termed "higher education." The optimists' view is that this presents an especially challenging set of teaching problems, demanding innovative solutions and superior instruction. The pessimists (and many of their four-year colleagues) are appalled and, in moments of special discouragement or cynicism, term the junior colleges "baby-sitting" institutions, or devices for "keeping floods of young people off the labor market for two more years."

Neither extreme, of course, is wholly valid. But the fact remains that traditional teacher-expectations of freshman and sophomore students are simply not applicable in most junior colleges. Instead of relative homogeneity of backgrounds and abilities, the instructor faces heterogeneity of a really extraordinary sort. Instead of "usual" collegiate motivations in students, teachers deal with motives-for-being-in-college ranging from immediate employability to fantasy notions about careers wholly unrelated to the obvious abilities (or lack of them) brought by the student to his college experience. In the comprehensive community colleges, where the bulk of students attend, no one is resident: everyone, including faculty, is a commuter. Typically, students still "go home at night," just as they did in high school — and this often poses special challenges which will be alluded to later. Also, because of the ebb-and-flow of the college population, campus life, as it has traditionally been thought of, simply does not exist. Student organizations find difficulty retaining identity, functions, and membership. Strong faculty advisory leadership is required in extracurricular areas.

These are some of the elements that make the junior college teacher's situation "unprecedented." Other elements are more appropriately referred to in other sections of this report.

How may the junior college teacher be characterized?

He is student-centered rather than subject-centered. He accepts and gladly works with students of an extraordinary range of abilities and motivations, ranging from the obviously-doomed-to-flunk student, who entered the junior college for lack of anything better to do, to the occasionally very bright and even brilliant student who, for reasons of his own, chose to begin his collegiate career in the local public college.

The teacher's pedagogical challenges are many-layered and complex: How to present college-level material in such ways that the four-year college transfer student will derive full value from it; yet at the same time, prevent the watering-down or oversimplifying of subject matter for the dull or under prepared student whose aims are either unrealistic fantasies, or nonexistent? How to give personal attention and needed help to students without crossing the subtle line into mollycoddling? How to cope with increasing class numbers without mechanizing instruction? How to keep up-to-date in his subject? How (in the case of vocational instructors) to produce employable graduates and at the same time provide them with as much general education as possible? How to spend the major portion of his energies and attention in actual instruction — and yet not lose that needful core of scholarly work that keeps his teaching fresh and pertinent to his students' needs and the developments in the discipline? And how, given the variety of student abilities and the pressure of their numbers, to break away from traditional freshman-sophomore instruction to new concepts and techniques?

What sort of teacher seems to be required?

A dean of instruction, and former veteran teacher, described the qualities he looks for in hiring instructors. Primarily, he said, there must be a basic articulateness: an ability to speak clearly and directly to a point at issue. Second, and of equal importance, is a capacity to explain, to illustrate, to interpret a point, and a willingness to work with student questions, no matter how elementary they might sometimes be. Third, the teacher needs a kind of "command presence," by which he meant a sufficient force of personality to convince students on early meeting that here is a teacher who not only knows what he is talking about, but is willing and even eager to communicate it. Well down the list of qualifications was a kind of academic standing, in the usual sense of degrees and accumulated formal training. The dean did not in any way derogate such academic background. "In fact," he said, "to be a truly good teacher of the kind I am describing, the person has to know his subject so well that he can simplify without either distorting or diluting his material."

Similarly student-focused were individual teacher's descriptions of their aims of instruction. Foremost among these was the desire to "get across" to the students — to communicate; to see that they "get it" — that they attain a working understanding of one level of material before going on to the next. Despite the varied student capacities, these teachers were pragmatically willing to take them where they were, and exert every effort to lift them to acceptable levels of performance. When asked about standards-for-college-work, most instructors asserted that these were not compromised unduly in the long run. "We've got an open-door college, to be sure," they would say in effect, "but after a reasonable time, if these students don't come up to standard, this place becomes a revolving door for them. The main thing is, they've had the chance."

A second, and allied aim of instruction, was the teacher's desire to emphasize student *attitudes* toward the matter being studied, rather than to expect more temporary pass-the-exam mastery of it. "I am more concerned," said one vocational instructor, "with my students' attitudes toward work than I am with the more limited objective of learning a skill. Most of the skills we are teaching will — at least probably will — be obsolete in a short time. But the attitudes toward work, and learning on the job, won't be. I may be teaching lithography, but I'm also trying to teach a state of mind."

For the most part, there was genuine enthusiasm for teaching undergraduates, and for working with them often on a person-to-person basis where individual students needed and sought help. Faculty in the open-door colleges typically have an open-office policy: while they are on campus, they are available to students. Generally, too, this policy is encouraged by administrative regulations to this effect. With exceptions, faculty accept the open-office policy as a fact of life in a commuting college. With no dormitory life, and with the consequent reduction, proportionately, of the numbers and kinds of student organizations, faculty often describe themselves, in effect, as the "upperclassmen" on campus — the mature members of a college group. "These students are a little like birds of passage," said one teacher. "They come in here with the morning tide, so to speak, and we work with them. And then, for the most part, they go home to study — or some of them have jobs in the evenings. Part of our teaching situation, almost literally, is that many of our students haven't had a chance to cut the psychological umbilical cord. Somehow, this doesn't 'feel like college,' and part of our job is to get them to recognize that it is."

Like their students, community college teachers themselves are "commuters." Typically, there is little or no on-campus or near-campus housing for faculty. Teachers arrive in the morning, have their classes, hold office hours, and leave in the afternoon. With their varied class schedules, it is difficult for department heads to set up meetings. Often, at the larger colleges, the individual instructors even within departments feel cut off from their colleagues; they lack the sense of belonging to "a faculty," in the traditional meaning of that term.

One instructor, a veteran of fourteen years of university teaching, now instructing at the local community college as a matter of choice, in one way summed up the "new breed." He said: "What a bunch of pragmatists these guys are! Their philosophy is: 'If it works, use it; if it doesn't, throw it out.' I find it tremendously refreshing. Nobody really blames the students for being 'dumb.' They just say, 'This kid has had terrible preparation,' and they then go to work to remedy the deficiencies as best they can. When they can't, they wash the student out. The challenge to real teaching is simply terrific. Most of my former university colleagues would throw up their hands and quit in horror."

The Teacher's Working Context

The junior college, speaking generically, is an institution attempting to define itself in the midst of change so rapid, demands made upon it so multifarious, and growth so explosive, that any definition arrived at today is likely to be irrelevant tomorrow. The image of the adolescent, shooting toward man's stature, all legs and wrists, constantly growing out of his clothes, may be trite — but it is apt; and the image applies equally to changing academic programs or growing physical facilities. For example, on every campus but one visited during this study, bulldozers, dust, mud, and the clank and rattle of construction were daily accompaniments to the quieter work going on in existing buildings. Especially in the newer comprehensive colleges, many additional courses and curriculums were in various stages of planning and design. Special faculty administrative *ad hoc* committees were at work on essential procedures: evaluation of teaching, tenure provisions, liaison with state and local authorities, new facilities planning, and many more. Much of this necessary activity was simply to keep up with the insistent demands of the present. Yet in a real fashion, the future is here before the present has found its solutions.

The junior college, too, is an institution largely without tradition; without those foundations of tested continuity to the past on which new structures of the future may be built. This lack of tradition is both a handicap and a source of unprecedented opportunities. The handicaps are mainly in the fact that a whole body of policies, practices, and aims for an institution must be decided almost *de novo*, in a sense; and their effects, for better or for ill, shape the present and immediate future of each college. The opportunities, on the other hand, are precisely in the fact of relative newness: in the chances to do "something different and better" with freshmen-sophomore instruction, for example; to meld or interfuse vocational and general education in ways not tried before; to make creative departures from generations-long academic patterns and expectations — not for the sake of innovation only, but because the older patterns are inappropriate to the new situations and demands.

One issue here, identified by many faculty, especially those in comprehensive community colleges, is general, subtle, and of possibly more important long-range significance than many others. This issue is whether, slowly and perhaps inexorably, the comprehensive colleges may be influenced, shaped, and perhaps dominated (especially administratively) by what some teachers term "The Standard Academic Mind." For example, they are concerned with whether traditional course-and-degree requirements for students; rigid and "standard" certifying requirements for teachers; more insistence upon hours and credits, and the like, may not tend to stifle or even destroy the flexible-response nature of the open-door college as it may (or can) meet and even anticipate the needs of the community it serves. Increasingly, for instance, faculty see a growing population of "mobile" students (particularly in vocational areas) seeking brief accreditations (6-13-18 week courses, with certification-of-completion) which will make them employable immediately; yet with further, and later, opportunities to apply the earned credits to a two-year degree. This flexibility is already a fact in many colleges. But faculty have expressed concern that as individual institutions grow larger (particularly multicampus urban community colleges) "administrative convenience" may tend to rigidify curriculums and requirements.

"Why shouldn't a student take three, four, or even five years to get his A.A. or A.A.S. degree?" many faculty ask. "If we insist — or come to insist — that every student has to be a fully enrolled degree candidate, we are inevitably going to wash out more and more of them. Even now, in some of our departments, the flunk-out, drop-out rate is 35 per cent and even higher in the first semester. This is a terrific waste of everybody's efforts: students, faculty, administration — and the college itself, in terms of facilities."

In some areas, particularly in the liberal arts transfer programs, faculty were restive about the demands of many four-year transfer institutions that lower division courses in the junior college parallel almost exactly — even to texts used — similar courses in senior institutions. "We recognize," said one teacher, "that often this is simply a matter of liaison, or communication with the four-year colleges. When we get a chance to explain, face to face, our course offerings, very often they'll accept them as we give them. But too often it seems to many of us, they seem to tell us that unless our courses fit their specifications, they are unacceptable. This is a pretty rigid attitude, and it penalizes many of our good students and a lot of us, too, since we have special teaching problems here."

However, many faculty indicated that the situation which most urgently needed fresh appraisal, more flexible criteria, and more independence of decision on the part of local administrations, was the whole realm of adequate and/or appropriate preparation of teachers: certification and related matters of salary levels and promotions; bread-and-butter as well as professional considerations. They expressed real concern for the future if, for example, statewide requirements for teacher-employment in junior colleges became more and more rigidly patterned. Speaking for many, one teacher said: "Here, we need a master's degree to be certified. Agreed, there ought to be some kind of assumption as a floor, or a starting point. But many of us feel that hundreds — maybe thousands — of potential junior college teachers, with a B.A. or a B.S. *and* a number of years of work or professional experience, may be closed out of teaching because they 'haven't got the hours.' We feel that local districts, or states, ought to allow individual college administrations a lot more freedom in certifying or employing people like this, and making their own evaluations of equivalents to academic credits."

Similar opinions, though by no means as consistently expressed, were made about the whole system of salary schedules and regular "steps-and-increments." Most faculty who objected to being locked into the system recognized its administrative convenience, and perhaps its necessity for budget predictions, if for nothing else. They recognized, too, that some junior colleges have been able to inject elements of variability into typical schedules by adding pay increments for attendance at noncredit summer institutes, related work experience, and (occasionally) publication or significant contributions to projects involving the development of the college. Yet basically the objectors felt that the ladder-and-step system was too reminiscent of secondary school, and that the trend was toward rigidity rather than flexibility.

But when the question of merit pay was raised, the familiar arguments of resistence were offered: "Who will do the evaluating?" "It will just rouse hard feelings." And most often, "We may not like the system; but we'd certainly like to hear of places that have figured out something new and better."

Whatever the illustrations referring to "standard academic patterns," the thrust of the junior college faculty's concern was toward greater, not less, flexibility in every area, including graduate school requirements either for teacher-preparation or later refreshment for teachers already on the job. They offered few "solutions" to this problem. They recognized the many difficulties (especially administrative) in achieving this aim, particularly as colleges grow larger.

"Here's Sam's Law," said one wryly: "Systems grow cruder as outfits grow huger. Bad rhyme. Good law." Yet, as one president, chief officer of a college of nearly 14,000 students, succinctly put it: "The chief challenge to us is to learn new arts in the management of intellectual activity. The old ways won't do."

Echoing him, many faculty remarked: "The junior college *is* a unique educational invention. We ought to be finding unique solutions to our problems — not just the patterns established by the four-year colleges, or by public school systems. This is an administrator's job, basically.

It's ours (faculty) too, but the administrators establish the situations we work in."

Indeed, if an overall impression (or even conclusion) may be derived from this study, it is that the chief issue affecting the junior college teacher is the administrative context in which he works. Taking "administration" in its widest sense to include not only college executive officers, but boards of trustees, state junior college offices, and legislatures, then the faculty member is saying that, in relation to himself, administration is tradition-bound, confused in its aims, unimaginative, and too typically inflexible. This is a blunt indictment. It is not in any way directed at the administrators of the colleges visited in the course of this study. Rather, it is a reflection of faculty awareness that their professional situation, both now and in the future, is closely affected by decisions made and regulations passed in state legislatures, in district board meetings, and in the appointment of administrators for individual colleges.

For instance, faculty are nearly unanimous in their desire that the junior college be genuinely considered a segment of *higher* education. Yet in some areas (including entire states) the basic decision has not yet been made as to whether the multiplying junior colleges should remain under the general fiscal and administrative control of public school systems, or should be independent entities, deriving their policies and a significant measure of fiscal support from the districts which they serve. One consequence of this indecision is increasing conflict between what faculty term the "vested interests" of local school superintendents, and the administrators of the two-year colleges. In the rising acrimony of debate in some areas, the real issues of the future growth and direction of the junior colleges tend to be oversimplified, confused, and polarized in special-interest groups seeking to influence the state legislature. "And *we* are caught in the middle," said a veteran teacher bitterly. "If we are to be *college* teachers, we need to have a whole administrative set-up that is not dominated by the secondary school mentality. Our problems are different from the teachers in K-through-12 — but here, we are lumped right in with them by a board and a superintendent who are more accustomed to thinking in terms of hot lunches, school bus problems, and PTA's than they are of things that affect us: tenure, salary levels, professional growth, departmental budgets, and so on."

Faculty generally recognize, however, that district autonomy in itself will not automatically solve their problems. Often, they see their own administrators so tangled in a web of local and state regulations (developed patchwork fashion over a period of years) that freedom to make fresh or innovative educational decisions is seriously impaired. Consider, for example, the college president, highly respected by his faculty, who must meet his district board every two weeks with a detailed report: and who is required, among other things, to make specific requests for money expenditures exceeding $50 of items not budgeted: and this at a college of over 7,000 students and 300 faculty, with a physical plant valued at over $25 million. Faculty point out that a president in such a situation, no matter how capable he is, certainly is not free to administer an educational enterprise: his board is doing the administering. And the effects on faculty are not at all remote. As one teacher said, "No, I don't take my students on field trips any more if I can help it. By the time I finish filling out the forms the board wants, waiting for authorization, getting money (or the college vehicles), the time has usually passed when the field trip was related to the course material." Again on field trips, another teacher said, "We have to put in at the beginning of every year the exact field trips we want, when, how many students, what for, and what it will cost. So what if a good trip becomes available during the year? Not budgeted. We don't go. So I've stopped bothering."

One member of a music department in a large community college said: "The official attitude is that music is a frill. At least this is what the legislature seems to say. They have ruled that piano must be taught *as a class*. Now how do you teach a class to play the piano? In groups of thirty — which is what I've got? Or, another thing, budget money for instruments is so restricted that it's going to take me about five years to buy enough instruments for a small band."

Another instructor: "According to law in this state, junior colleges are 'higher education.' But do you know what the legislature requires us to do? Have a flag salute every morning before the first class. Higher education? Baloney."

Science instructor: "We are in a state system, and our budget has to go to the state office for approval. For instance, here's what happened to me last year. In February, my courses were overenrolled. I needed four more microscopes — badly. So I put in a requisition. But there wasn't a dollar authorization from the legislature until early this summer. Now here it is late October, and they tell me I may get two microscopes by December. Why two instead of the four I ordered? Well, *they* (either the state office or the legislature, or both) always seem to assume that we're padding our budget requests, so they just cut."

Librarian: "The state financial set-up doesn't provide for a separate library budget. Suppose a faculty member wants a $10 book right away — say, in October. He may get it next year, because I had to make up my part of the total budget last spring, and that book wasn't part of the total. So what do I do? Either I pad the budget to try to allow some flexibility — or I tell the faculty member to think a year ahead, and then feel like a fool because often books that he may want haven't even been published."

These are not isolated examples. They reflect what is already occurring, and may (faculty worriedly speculate) increasingly occur as individual institutions grow in size, and junior college systems become more complex and create their own inevitable bureaucracies.

It may be significant to note that faculty generally were not aware of the acute and growing shortage of qualified junior college administrators — at all levels — and, perhaps typically, were prone to generalize from their own local situations.

A related issue, and closer to home for the faculty member, is the headlong growth of an individual college, or of a single campus which is part of a (usually urban) complex of several campuses under a central administration. Almost inevitably, internal communication tends to break down in such situations. Typical comments: "Yeah, we've got administration-by-memo around here. But nobody reads theirs (administration's) and it's pretty obvious that they don't read ours (faculty's.)" Another: "Our chain of command looks pretty good on paper. But if you've got a division head or a department head who isn't in there pitching all the time for you, your message doesn't get to the top. Our division head is an upgraded teacher, with no experience in administration. His theory of 'administering' is to leave a problem on his desk until it goes away." Or: "There ought to be a limit to the size of one college — or one campus." Asked to comment on the notion of limitation, one veteran administrator stated what many others said in the same vein: "If I could get all the money and facilities I really need, I'd limit each college, or each separate campus of a district, to about 3,500 students and no more than 150 faculty — and leave each of these units to be as autonomous as possible; free to develop its own character. But, quite bluntly, it would be fantastically expensive, and I don't think the public would pick up the bill. And further, I don't know where we would find enough well-trained administrators to head these units — let alone find others to staff the lower echelons of divisions and departments. *There's* the crucial shortage, if you ask me."

The main faculty concern in the total administrative context is that their voice be effectively heard, especially in matters affecting them as professionals. There is little doubt that junior college faculty will organize — locally, statewide, or even nationally — to the degree that they feel poorly represented at all significant decision-making levels. Many politically aware teachers shrewdly predict that national education groups, conscious of the growing ranks of junior college instructors, will see this group as a potentially potent new power bloc, and will woo them strenuously for membership. Thoughtful faculty are genuinely worried that what they call "a union-vs-management" situation may develop — to the decided detriment of true professional status. But they will seek, and in some areas are already seeking, means of power through collective action at state and local levels — and possibly, in a few years, even nationally. Public junior college teachers do not feel restricted by the web of traditional, "unwritten" sanctions on direct action which inhibit their four-year colleagues. Whatever the means of organization — whether through faculty senates, local chapters of the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, state organizations, or even local area *ad hoc* groups — faculty militancy will grow in direct proportion to their sense of isolation (whether fancied or real) from the sources of power that control their professional destinies.

Section Two: 2

BASIC ISSUES AND PROBLEMS AS DESCRIBED BY TEACHERS

Basic Issues and Problems

In this section are described some of the basic problem areas with which junior college teachers are professionally concerned. They speak of inadequate time to do their jobs properly; their need for professional refreshment; their role(s) in college government; professional affiliations; teaching in the junior college as a permanent career; faculty relationships to guidance and counseling; academic and other preparation for college teaching; and other matters.

Almost without exception, their responses to questions were thoughtful and studded with examples and illustrations highlighting the problems discussed. Usually, they expressed satisfaction that such a study was being conducted, and a typical comment was, "Thank goodness, somebody on the national level is interested in this."

Indeed, one striking fact — familiar but worth underscoring — is borne home again and again to anyone who visits junior college teachers around the country: individual faculties are isolated from one another, both as groups and as individuals within separate disciplines. Means of communication nationally are either nonexistent or just beginning to be established, through already organized professional groups in the academic disciplines, or newly formed national or regional junior college associations. (The new regional organizations for teachers in two-year colleges being set up by the National Council of Teachers of English is one such example.) Such organizational projects are difficult, expensive, and time-consuming — especially the formation of national groups — and these tend to *evolve* slowly, rather than spring into being. Yet there is unquestionably an immediate need for junior college teachers to have multiple and effective sources of contact with one another, so that innovations in curriculum and teaching practices, the development and sharing of instructional materials, and the mutual profit and stimulation of discussion, can contribute to their sense of professional unity.

Indeed, though the junior college faculty member asserts — and believes — that he is, in fact, "in higher education," he is not at all certain of his professional identity, particularly since he does not have the sense of having a professional "home." Typically, for example, his institution has an inadequate (or nonexistent) travel budget for faculty, and if an individual teacher wants to attend a conference or regional meeting, he either pays part or all of his own way — or he doesn't go. Effectively tied to his own campus, the teacher is apt to lack the awareness that he belongs to a larger community of scholars, including his four-year college and university colleagues. He *knows* he is a "college" teacher; but he feels very much cut off, at least at present, from many of those associations, organizations, and similar sources of communication which his four-year counterparts have developed over the years.

TIME

With the unvarying insistence of a metronome's tick, faculty pinpointed their most pressing professional problem with one word: *Time*. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration that most of this report consists in exploring the facets of meaning in this terse response. There is not enough time, the teachers said over and over, to keep up in my own field; to develop innovations or new methods in my own teaching; to do a proper job with individual students; to investigate what other junior colleges are doing; to study for myself; to discuss educational matters with my fellow-teachers; even, more often than I like to think, to do a decent job of preparation for my classes; to refresh myself, even occasionally, by brief association with some of my colleagues in my own discipline, whether at conventions, special regional meetings, or whatever; to function effectively on faculty committees; to help in advising student organizations.

The list multiplies. Yet again, with heartening unanimity, the sound of complaint (or mere typical faculty griping) was missing. Rather, the entire thrust of the comments about lack of time was toward frustration at not being able to do the kind of truly professional job the teachers saw as necessary and desirable. One faculty member, whose college had grown in student population from about 300 to nearly 10,000 in less than a decade, said: "I feel like the driver of a huge bus, crammed with people, careening down a winding mountain road at increasing speed. I'm followed by other buses — and more all the time and always the speed increasing — and we simply can't stop. All I can do is concentrate on keeping the vehicle on the road. Yet, more than anything else, I'd like a turn-off once in a while to ask myself what the destination of the bus is . . . And why and *how* I'm going where I am."

Another said: "It's tough to see any real way out of this time bind. Most of us on the faculty talk about it constantly. For myself, I feel like a man caught in a vortex, being swirled around faster and faster each year. I don't blame our administration: I know they're caught in the same thing, and I guess they're doing the best they can with the limitation on the mill-levy (tax ceiling) and all. I've been here six years, and this increasing pressure (of time and student number) sure doesn't help my teaching any."

Though isolated examples do not make adequate generalizations, the four that follow (each from a different college) are typical of many dozens similarly related.

1. *History instructor:* Teaching hours per week: 15. Student load: 150 (thirty students in each of five sections.) Weekly division curriculum committee meetings: one hour. Adviser to student political club: about 1½ hours per week. He said, "On the face of it, this isn't so tough. But here's the way it really works out. The college officially expects me to be on campus, either teaching or holding office hours, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday

through Friday. 15 of these hours I spend in classroom instruction. But, because we *are*, after all, a student-centered college, I find most of my office hours taken up with individual students who need help, and I find it difficult to get much of my own work done. So there's 40 hours. Now, suppose I give each student one three-page paper a week and one brief objective quiz — and I don't like those. Suppose I'm really efficient and can correct a paper every seven minutes: that adds 17.5 hours. And let's say I correct a quiz every four minutes: that adds 10 hours. Add the division meeting and my adviser time for another 2½ hours. Total time per week: 70 hours, give or take a couple. Now here's the interesting thing. My gross salary is $7,200 this year — I've got an M.A. plus 28 hours. In a 30-week academic year, I work 2,100 hours — which makes my hourly pay $3.43. Hardly professional. You wanted the time problem spelled out as I see it. There it is in a nutshell."

2. *Biology instructor:* He has 23 contact hours a week, 15 of which are lecture classes, 8 are laboratories; a total of 218 students, 86 of whom were also in the labs. He does all of his own preparatory work in setting up the lab sessions. He explained: "Well, this *is* an unusual situation this year. But they (administration) haven't been able to find lab assistants for me, and anyway we opened the year much more overenrolled than we expected." When asked whether he thought this sort of load would continue another year, he responded: "I certainly hope not. But I'm told that the budget is awfully tight — and our projections of enrollment show a big jump in student numbers next year."

3. *English teacher:* She has five sections of freshman composition, with section enrollment limited to twenty-five. Her college permits instructors to teach one evening school section, in addition to day schedules, and she has an evening journalism class with thirty-eight students. Weekly hours of teaching: 18. Total student load: 163. When asked how many themes she was able to assign in a semester, she said six.

4. *Speech instructor:* 13[illegible] students in five sections. She stated that it took her nine weeks of the first semester to

"get through" one three-minute prepared speech per student. She had neither time nor adequate recording facilities to make tapes or records of her students' voices for instructional purposes. She is, in addition, adviser to the debating team. She takes trips, not only with this team, but occasionally is invited to judge debates on other campuses within the state. She enjoys this, but she said, "The trouble is, every time I leave the campus even for two days, I feel guilty, because I know I am depriving a certain number of students their one chance to make a speech in class."

Anecdotal "evidence" of this sort is, of course, far too skimpy and subjectively unreliable to support an assumption that junior college teachers do not have "time" to do a wholly professional job because they may be overworked. Yet reliable statistical evidence, obtained nationwide, would be outdated before it was even collected and analyzed, such is the explosive growth of these institutions. Further, the administrations of many colleges are thoroughly aware of the effects of teacher-overloading upon the instruction, and are making tremendous, though only partially successful, efforts to hold the line.

Yet the testimony of veteran faculty (those with over five years of service at a single institution) appears to indicate that what were "abnormal" teaching loads five or six years ago have crept inexorably to be considered "normal" now. These faculty are thoughtfully and maturely concerned about the future quality of their teaching. In almost identical words, several of them commented in this vein: "You know, a few years ago, when this place was smaller, the teaching challenges were really stimulating — in a good way, fun. But now, I don't feel that I'm teaching students: I'm processing them. There isn't time to do much else. There are too many of them — and too few of us."

Asked about their suggestions for possible solutions to the problem, more sophisticated and perceptive faculty on various campuses indicated their awareness that these went well beyond their own immediate administrations, though ultimately solutions would begin at that level. Especially at community colleges, faculty saw that the policy-making bodies — district trustees, boards of education, and, ultimately, state legislatures — "needed to be educated to the realities" of class loads, professional preparation, adequate recompense, and the implications of the open-door policy in relation to effective instruction. Inevitably, the problems nearly always stemmed from lack of fully adequate funds — for added teaching staff, more attractive salaries, travel allowances, clerical and other nonteaching assistance, for example. Typical of many, one teacher said, "I don't think the public realizes the magnitude of what it is asking of these community colleges, of us. Here we are, staggering along on an antiquated method of taxation (mainly real estate levies), going back to the public again and again for bond issues — which seem to be defeated more and more regularly these days. But we are really using a patchwork method, and time is running out on us. Everybody knows that there will be tens of thousands more people to educate; but I don't know where anybody has really faced up to *all* the implications of this."

Faculty themselves feel a kind of frustrated bafflement as to how the "public" (and their duly constituted boards or policy groups) is to be made realistically aware of the size of the bill they will ultimately have to pay to sustain quality education in the two-year colleges. They recognize that creating this awareness is basically the job of their own individual college administrations. But at the same time, most of them are fair-minded enough to be aware of and to appreciate the tremendous pressures also currently placed on their administrators — including fund-raising; the obtaining through local, state, or federal sources, the necessary capital funds for needed new facilities; the raising of faculty salary levels to compete for good people in a shrinking teacher market; and the sheer weight of the clerical tasks imposed by the rapid increase of student, faculty, and staff population.

It must emphatically be stated, however, that these faculty comments about the need for "more money" were not usually the familiar pleas for "better salaries." Doubtless, better salaries in many areas are not only desirable, but mandatory, if vigorous and capable young people are to be attracted to careers in junior college teaching; and if good teachers are to be retained. But the teachers were simply and realistically equating adequate funds with time — their professional time — and what kind of time sufficient institutional funding would buy. Typically, a teacher would say: "Frankly, on a comparative basis, my own salary is not too bad. Sure, I'd like more; but I'm getting along. But what we really need here is at least two more people in the department so that we could cut down the load and give the rest of us a chance to do a better job." Or, "I'm not really griping for a higher salary. But if the district wants its money's worth out of me in the next few years, they'd better find some way to buy me — and lots of others — some time to go back to graduate school in the summer, or go to special institutes or things like that. Some year, I'd like not to have to teach summer sessions just because I need the income." Or, "I'm tired to the bone. For four years now I've taught a full regular schedule; an evening session course; and eight weeks every summer. I know the district isn't wealthy. But if they'd give us salaries high enough to give us some flexibility, I'd be worth a lot more to them than I am now because I could pay my own way to take some graduate courses. The district doesn't have a budget for allowances like this, either." Or, "It's frustrating how you get trapped on this salary schedule thing. I've got my M.A., and I get my annual increment, just like any high school teacher. But if I want to pull up on the salary steps, I've got to add some graduate hours. When? How? I'm teaching all the time, and when I get through, I haven't got anything left. Maybe my load is too heavy, I don't know; everybody else here is in the same boat, and I don't mean to complain. But I tell you, I'm drained."

These are not isolated comments. Indeed, they ran through hundreds of interviews as a kind of wistful refrain: How do I do the job asked of me, and still continue to be truly professional? Stay alive in my subject area? Find time to study, to think, to plan.

One teacher summed up: "I suppose it comes down to this: the public has got to start to understand, with St.

Paul, that 'the laborer is worthy of his hire.' I just wish they understood a little better *what* they were hiring us to do."

* * *

COMMENT: Faculty identification of "lack of time" as their main professional problem was far too uniform and insistent to be dismissed either as complaint or as distortion of reality. Indeed, even if their perception of this problem was to be discounted by 50 per cent, it would still pose vexing and far-reaching questions for the junior college as a developing educational force in this country.

For example, if — in the words of one teacher — "the word gets around the graduate schools about typical teaching loads and time pressure, what's going to make junior college teaching attractive to the bright, capable young people with a real future in education?" There seems to be little doubt that "the word" is not slow in circulating. At present, junior college presidents and deans may not be experiencing too much difficulty in finding teacher candidates, except in certain chronically short areas — in the sciences, for example. But the question for the long-term future remains: *can the junior college attract and hold enough of the best young scholars and prospective instructors now in our graduate programs?*

A concomitant question, though with a different emphasis: in the minds of college and university graduate departments (and their students), is the image of the junior college, as a place for a full and satisfying career in teaching, sufficiently attractive to interest able, scholarly, potentially productive young people? With a handful of exceptions, the answer is *no:* or at least, no, *not yet.* There is, to be sure, a heartening and growing interest in the university community about the future staffing problems of junior colleges. Some universities now have, or are just establishing, specific programs for training junior college instructors. The questions remain, however: are these programs fully appropriate to junior college needs? Are they rigorous enough to offer challenges at least equal to other graduate programs? Are they drawing first-rate candidates? *What sort of professional future can the junior college itself hold out to these graduate students?* A full, specific response to this last question is one of the large and immediately important tasks of junior colleges in their public relations — in the best and widest sense of that term.

Yet if, as the responses of practicing teachers themselves seem to indicate, junior college teaching is going to be an experience in increasing professional frustration — especially insofar as personal and intellectual growth is concerned — the "image" of the junior college may persist as a place which will hire the faintly second-rate: the Ph.D. candidate who "couldn't make it"; the "dedicated mediocrity"; the "former high school teacher who wants to get into higher education"; the "intellectual baby-sitter." (These phrases are those used by junior college teachers themselves.) The persistence of an image of this kind would, obviously, be devastating to the future of the junior college movement.

Professional Refreshment and Up grading

One of the most striking common denominators of response from faculty was their keen awareness of the need to keep abreast of developments in their own disciplines; to refresh and upgrade themselves professionally. Varying only in the way the statements were phrased, the concern of teachers about this problem is reflected by two typical examples:

Biology instructor: "Mine is perhaps the fastest growing field in science right now. My last graduate work was four years ago. I have been to two National Science Foundation summer sessions. But one of them was directed mainly toward the upper level of college; and the other was pointed mainly to high school. Oh, yes, I did get something out of each of these; but—" and he waved a hand toward a double shelf of books in his office—"there are at least fifteen books up there that I have not read, and I should have read them months ago, and I don't know when I am going to get time to read them. And also, I want some help on the freshman-sophomore level, particularly with the kinds of students I get."

English teacher: "For the past couple of years, I have had the awful feeling that I am spending my accumulated intellectual capital faster than I can replace it. I just don't have any time to replace it, and I would love to."

When the problem was explored in further discussion, and in detail, it became many faceted and complex, and depended in part upon the geographical situation of a college (with the availability of universities nearby, for example), and the familiar dilemmas of time and money.

For example, few junior colleges have adequate sabbatical leave programs. Even where these exist, they are only partially satisfactory. Where an institution does have a sabbatical program, it often provides full pay for one semester or half pay for a full year; or in some cases full pay only for one quarter and half pay for a second quarter. A few institutions do have funds to give "grants" to selected faculty for summer study. But these grants are rarely adequate (usually less than $500) and the faculty member who wants to undertake summer study invariably finds himself out of pocket.

The problem of professional refreshment seems particularly acute for teachers in the liberal arts areas. Here, little if any federal or state money is available for programs such as those provided by the National Science Foundation, for example, or for some vocational instructors. Typically, the liberal arts teacher has a master's degree; is employed by a college; and then at considerable personal sacrifice over a number of years, slowly accumulates additional graduate credits in his discipline.

Even where a junior college is located in a large urban area, with one or more four-year colleges or universities nearby, the graduate course offerings are often inappropriate to the needs of these teachers, they report. There is a strong desire, strongly expressed, for more graduate offerings designed to assist teachers with the problems and materials of freshman and sophomore instruction. Indeed, many a teacher said, in effect: "I do wish that the graduate schools knew more about what we are trying to do. With our open-door admissions policy, we have a tremendous range of ability in our students; and I think it is undoubtedly true that our kind of teaching situation is far different from lower division instruction in a regular four-year college. We don't want graduate courses that are designed mainly for the Ph.D. or for the research scholar. We want broad, solid, general courses, full of the kind of material that we are going to have to teach."

Another stated that she wished graduate schools would pay more attention to the "general practitioner." She said: "Because, really, that is what those of us in the community colleges are — general practitioners — as against specialists in graduate schools or the heavily discipline-oriented people in most of the four-year colleges." It is significant that in this, and many more comments, instructors were not suggesting watered-down versions of regular lower-division courses. Rather, they were groping for help in designing fresh and more effective ways to handle this level of material with the varied student groups, especially in community colleges.

Repeatedly expressed was the desire of the teachers — the need — to have more face-to-face work with their university colleagues on problems of all kinds. "What we really need to do," said one instructor, "is to get down to a *basic rethinking of the nature and purpose of graduate study.* I think it is a very different thing to say, 'I am going to be a college teacher of English,' as against, 'I am going to be a scholar of English in a university.' The two are not necessarily incompatible, of course; but the difference in emphasis would make significant changes in the context and purposes of a lot of graduate study."

Again and again, *sharply,* was the desire expressed to take a new, and possibly unorthodox look, at the materials and teaching methods in freshman and sophomore years — and this was especially true in the statements from instructors in the liberal arts.

One instructor said, "If we were to be ruthlessly honest with ourselves, we would admit we are teaching the same old stuff in the same old way. Standard textbooks, students sitting in front of us in rows, papers, quizzes, and all of the traditional apparatus. A lot of us would like to try some innovations. But we are not sure how to go about it. We usually don't have enough time to try it. And frankly, we don't know where to turn for help."

Another avenue for professional refreshment is opportunity for faculties from various institutions to get together in meetings, brief institutes or seminars, or meetings of professional associations in the various disciplines. Yet here again, the junior college instructor identifies his situation as something less than satisfactory. In many an institution, allowances for travel are either inadequate or nonexistent. In others, payment for travel is restricted within the state. In some cases, in order to leave campus at all a teacher must find a substitute to "cover" his classes. The whole question of getting substitutes for such times as when teachers were sick or could not get to work, or were to be away at a conference for a day or two, came under heavy criticism by faculty. Mainly, the criticisms were that the substitute would, in the words of one of a group of faculty: "Go in there and take the roll and crack a few jokes, then after about ten minutes, tell the students to go out and get a cup of coffee." Faculty were unanimous in their resentment of what they call the "secondary school attitude" which required them to obtain substitutes.

Many teachers, especially those on larger campuses, felt that well-designed and conducted in-service programs would be of tremendous help in keeping themselves alive in their disciplines. Typically, however, where colleges did have some kind of in-service experiences for faculty, teachers criticized these as haphazard, "off-the-cuff" and, "a bunch of people getting together fairly regularly to pool their ignorance." When asked for suggested remedies for this situation, most of them felt that the help of expert outside consultants working with special faculty groups to plan in-service programs, was a good solution. Others felt that "the administration" should take more initiative in this direction.

Indeed, usually by indirection, but sometimes with startling bluntness, faculty identified the root of their problem of professional refreshment and upgrading as what amounts to administrative lack of awareness that the problem does indeed, exist, and that it is rapidly growing more acute. By "administrative," the faculty did not necessarily mean their own immediate administrative officers; but rather the larger context of administration represented by boards of trustees, the local boards of education (where the junior college was under the governance of the local school board), and state agencies — including the legislature — whose regulations and requirements eventually affected their teaching situation. Typically, for example, one faculty member said with a good deal of vehemence, "I truly do admire our president. He is a wonderful guy, and he is doing everything he can for us. But I know enough about this situation to realize that he is caught up in a tangle of regulations which he must obey. He has got to handle all kinds of pressures — financial, political, and social (from the local community) — and, frankly, I don't see how he can do as well as he does. Almost every member of this faculty respects him. But, like us, he doesn't have time to be an educator. All he has time to do, as it looks from my viewpoint, is to keep the wheels of this increasingly larger machine just greased enough that they won't stop spinning."

It is hardly necessary to elaborate example after example relating to this problem of professional growth. On campus after campus, and in dozens and even hundreds of interviews, the questions were:

"How can I keep up?"

"If the pressure is like this now, what is it going to be in four or five years?"

"I sometimes wonder whether this open-door policy is a good idea. If I get any more students to cope with, I just won't have time to study — or even do a decent job of preparing the classes I do have. What is the solution? More teachers? Yes — more good ones. And where are they going to come from?"

"Is the fifteen-hour teaching load really practical in the long run? I don't mind hard work; but I would like my hard work to be on a true professional level. Is there any discussion of this going on at the national level?"

"Do the universities really know what we need from them? Who is telling them — anybody?"

"Is there any way we can develop special resources for junior college teachers? I mean things like summer institutes all over the country, special departments or even portions of departments in university graduate schools; lists of consultants we could call on to visit our campuses and tell us what is going on in other places . . . I suppose there are many other possibilities."

The accumulated testimony of faculty concerning their need for continuing study, increased associations with those in their own — and other — disciplines, and other means of professional improvement, indicates an apparent priority problem for junior colleges countrywide, not only now, but even more acutely in the immediate future. Though they generally agree philosophically and practically with the "open-door policy," many faculty have an almost foreboding sense that this policy and the national determination for education for "everyone who wants it after high school," may, unless large-scale provisions can be made for helping faculty, inexorably milk dry the major resource of their colleges: namely, the intellectual capital of its teachers.

Further, many teachers are concerned about future recruitment of instructors. "Up to now," said one department head, "we've been fairly well satisfied with the recruiting picture. But I think unless we can show the really sharp young people that we can offer them real chances for professional growth and real long-term job-satisfaction, we're going to get more and more high school retreads, who see the junior college as a step up; or candidates who couldn't quite make the grade elsewhere; or people for whom teaching in the local college is a convenient way to pick up a second family income."

"Or," commented one division head, "take John X, for instance. He's a real find: an exciting teacher — and he's apparently able to keep up on his scholarship — so far. But he's getting edgy about the load and the rigid salary pattern. On our present salary rate, it will be seven years before he tops $10,000. I know I'm going to lose him, and I won't blame him if he moves on to the university: he's got his union card, his Ph.D. My question is, if we can't keep the good ones — and find it harder and harder to attract the potentially good ones, what's going to be left, say, in ten years? The bottom of the bucket?"

Sometimes, the administrative answer to this question smacked more than a little of complacency. A chairman of a large department responded to the point by saying, "I have a fine group of dedicated people. They don't think they're overworked — at least I don't get many complaints about it." But a check with the librarian showed that the members of this department used library resources least for their own study. And the same basic textbooks in each of three courses in that department were in their fourth year of use. One (perhaps embittered) member of this department said, "Dedicated? Possibly. But to what? Not rocking the boat? I'd like to see some ferment around here."

After a long, probing discussion with a group of faculty on the whole matter of professional growth, one teacher wrote this summation:

> I gathered, from the discussion we had yesterday, and from the reading I've done, and some visits to other junior colleges, that we're moderately well off here at ——— College. Comparatively, anyway, salaries are not too bad; working conditions compare well with other places; and, considering how big we are, and how fast we are growing, our relations with the administration are reasonably cordial.
>
> But frankly, a lot of us are getting concerned about the high-sounding phrases (making high-sounding claims) about the junior college *per se:* that it is a "teaching institution, characterized by excellence of instruction;" that "guidance and counseling programs are specially important, since the junior college is a student-centered type of institution;" and that "the junior college is a unique response to the American people's demand for further educational opportunities."
>
> I won't argue with the *hopes* — even possible aims — embodied in these statements. But, as far as many of us can find out, guidance programs in junior colleges are *not* all that good. And we may claim "excellent instruction," but we don't have much proof of it.
>
> My point is: I wonder whether maybe our administrators, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and other so-called "spokesmen" for junior colleges may not be confusing incantation with actuality, or substituting perfectly honest hopes for reality.
>
> On this campus, for instance, many of us would ask: how "excellent" is instruction when the average teaching load is 15 hours, and the average student load ranges from 150 to 200 (in the liberal arts, especially)? Or how "excellent" is instruction when every member of ——— department teaches from the same syllabus, the same textbook, at the same rate — and uses the same examinations?
>
> Or, we would ask, how good is our guidance department when several of their people don't know the difference between our physics course for vocational majors and the

physics course for transfer students, just to give an example? Or when 25 per cent of the students have to be rescheduled because of faulty placement?

I don't mean to be negative about all of this, because I care a lot about this college and what it is trying to do. You asked us for recommendations about what we thought should be done in this whole area of professional growth for junior college teachers. For a start, here are a few things we all agreed to:

1. Establish the standard teaching load as 12 hours, with student loads dropped proportionately. (We are aware that this is an expensive suggestion — but the *real* question is: what does the public want for its money — quality or quantity?)

2. Expand guidance and counseling programs on a massive scale; and then improve articulation between faculty and guidance departments.

3. Either raise salaries significantly, so that we can buy our own time for further graduate work, attendance at professional meetings, or whatever; or provide enough special funds for travel, study, and the like, so that faculty can take advantage of available opportunities.

4. Educate local boards, district boards, state departments, and state legislatures to some of the realities of our teaching situation so that they can be more realistic when they appropriate money and establish regulations for employment of teachers, salary schedules, and similar things.

In varying degree, depending upon their local situation, faculty on other campuses agreed, both in principle and in detail, to these comments and recommendations.

* * *

COMMENT: Implicit in the faculty discussions about their continuing professional refreshment is the basic question of job satisfaction on a long-term basis. For a teacher — as, presumably, for any other professional — such satisfaction is just as important as salary, if not more so. Among other things, "job satisfaction" means regular opportunities for dialogue with colleagues; for additional specialized study; for continued growth and intellectual stimulation. And, as teachers justly pointed out, provision of these opportunities is an administrative responsibility, fundamentally.

A priority need, faculty state, is for thoroughly planned, carefully led in-service programs, of all kinds, on a continuing basis. "In-service programs for us," said one teacher, "should be just as much a part of the general curriculum, so to speak, as courses for students. We need programs using our own resources; bringing in outside people; one-shot occasions for special needs; sometimes semester-long courses, in effect; and lots more. Sure, this takes time and money and organization. And it would have to be well done, or it shouldn't be done at all. But it would be a great help to most of us."

Teachers were emphatic, too, about wanting real quality in any in-service offerings. "None of this half-baked, casual stuff," said one. "I've experienced those, and they're worse than nothing. People get their hopes up, suffer through a couple of perfunctory sessions, and drift away. Then, if you try it again sometime, they just ignore you."

The person with basic responsibility for administering such programs, faculty agreed, should be the dean of instruction, or his equivalent. Depending on the type of organization of faculty on a particular campus, the dean should work with department or division heads and a select faculty committee to determine both needs and interests of the teaching staff for in-service opportunities. Faculty were aware, too, that adequate programs would require budget commitments, possibly of considerable size, especially if outside consultants and resource people would be brought to a campus. But they considered that in-service costs should legitimately be budgeted as regular items under cost of instruction.

Orientation of New Faculty

Fully adequate orientation of new faculty was an area of concern identified by many teachers — particularly for beginning instructors on large and rapidly growing campuses. One department chairman said, "The college as a whole added forty-seven new faculty this fall — and I had six in my department alone. Naturally, it's part of my job to see that my people get the orientation they need. But many of us feel that general orientation to the college should go well beyond that first day-long faculty meeting. We only get routine business done then, anyway."

Further orientation, teachers often said, should be fairly regular through the first semester — or at least the first quarter — of a new teacher's experience. They cited several reasons for this recommendation. Though the new staff member could be considered properly prepared in his own discipline, he was, more often than not, only vaguely informed about the nature of the comprehensive junior college, its general mission, and the specific aims of the institution which employed him. He needed more than a casual briefing on teaching policies and practices at his new college. He needed a fairly thorough introduction to typical problems of instruction posed by the kinds of students he could expect to work with. Some means or device, in short, is clearly desirable to help the new faculty member swiftly and effectively to become an integrated member of a cohesive teaching staff.

"I really flapped around here my first semester," said one new instructor. "My first day, we had what they called a 'new faculty workshop.' But all it really amounted to was making sure we knew how to handle all the forms and paper work, and how to keep roll books, and all that. And my department head tried his best to help me get started. We discussed texts and department exams and the kinds of things I was expected to teach in my classes. But when I met my first class a couple of days later, I certainly realized how little I knew that I should have known. The students were, in many ways, very different from anything I had expected. They asked me a lot of questions about the college that I couldn't begin to answer. I knew I'd have my own questions for the veterans in my department. But our schedules were all so different, I didn't see them very often. And at department meetings, we had too much else in the way of business for me to take up everybody's time with my ignorance. As I said, it took me about a semester to get my bearings and to have some kind of a realistic notion about what this college is trying to do, and my part in it."

It is apparent that, as with in-service programs, considerable administrative attention, time, and imagination will increasingly need to be devoted to faculty orientation, in a sense wider than usually considered. With the probability in the immediate future that larger and larger numbers of newly employed faculty will also be new to the junior college teaching experience, means of adequate professional orientation, appropriate to each institution, will have to be developed. This is especially obvious in the case of a newly founded college where orientation-in-depth is necessary, not only to create "a faculty" (instead of a group of diverse individuals who happen to be teaching), but also to forge a working consensus between administration and faculty concerning the aims and functions of the institution, and the possible directions of its growth.

Division and Department Heads

As individual campuses grow larger; and especially as urban junior college complexes multiply units under central administrations, the key person in the continuing effort to maintain and raise faculty professional standards will be the "middle-echelon" administrator-teachers: the division heads, department heads, or coordinators. They are the ones who have direct and effective contact with the top local administration. Already, at some of the larger colleges, such persons may have in their division as many as fifty or more teachers — the size of a complete faculty at several small junior colleges. It is by and through the division and department heads that internal communication — faculty-to-administration, or the reverse — is usually successful, or not. If these heads are competent administrators *and are given sufficient authority,* there is — or can be — a good measure of representative democracy in the smaller units. It is in the division, for example, where significant curriculum changes and adaptations are generally initiated, planned and carried through; where new faculty are oriented to the purposes and practices of the institutions; where individual teachers mainly have opportunities for professional satisfaction. Yet the testimony of presidents and deans is that the supply of such able, imaginative subadministrators is crucially short. "It is almost mandatory," said one president, "that such people come from the faculty. In fact, even as department heads, they ought to teach one course regularly, in addition to their administrative duties. But to identify teachers who are experienced enough, who have the potential for assuming both authority and responsibility, and who can be brought along, so to speak — *trained,* really — is one of my toughest jobs. We need to find ways to develop these middle-level educational leaders. They're the ones who have the most direct influence on our regular faculty."

This was testified to by many teachers, especially those on the larger community college campuses. As one said: "My division head really gets in there and plugs for us. For instance, last spring we decided to put a new course in one of our curriculums. I told the division head that I really needed a summer course at ———— University to bring me up to date; but I was too broke to finance it myself. He went right to the top and wrangled $400 from the administration as a 'study grant' assigned to our department. Without his understanding and help, I couldn't have taken the course; and it did help very much when the new class started in the fall."

* * *

COMMENT: It is a truism that internal communication tends to become increasingly difficult in direct proportion to the size of the organization. It is possible that this communication problem may be even more acute in a college than it is in an industrial or business organization. The college does not, for example, turn out a "product" which can be accurately described by a set of specifications. The individual members of the college organization also have more real autonomy of decision and action than is typical of an industrial employee. Teachers, for instance, run their own classrooms; interpret academic material in their individual fashions; and, more often than not, one teacher may operate under a set of assumptions markedly different from those of a colleague teaching the same material at the same level and even at the same rate. Further, administrators may (and all too often do) act on the belief that *their* set of assumptions is shared by faculty. (This is rarely the case!) As with any communications problem, frames of reference must at least be mutually understood between levels and among groups if any "message" is to be understood operationally.

Faculty testimony points up "poor communication on the campus" as a major problem. (That the problem is, in fact, endemic in higher education does not make it any the less real nor effective solutions to it any less needed.) Both faculties and administrations — especially administrations — must perforce develop and use means of communication that can operate effectively in situations where explosive growth and rapid change are continuing facts of life. It is unlikely that "the junior college situation" will stabilize much, if at all, within the next decade. If, for instance, internal communication is poor now, it will only get worse unless real effort and imagination can be brought to whatever institutional reorganization may be necessary to improve it.

It is in this context that the need for highly competent subadministrators referred to in this section is highlighted and underscored.

Faculty Participation in College Government

Like much else in the junior college movement, the role of the faculty member in the governing of this institution is affected by so many nontraditional factors that a new matrix of definition is required. (This assertion is especially true of community colleges — and all references here are to these public institutions.)

Until recently in higher education, the assumption has been that a college faculty, ideally, was a self-governing community of scholars, with major responsibilities in the shaping of educational policies; admission of students; budget allocations; significant participation in appointment, promotion, and dismissal of academic personnel, even including participation in the selection of deans, presidents, and other academic-administrative officers. Indeed, the 1960 statement of the American Association of University Professors includes not only these faculty prerogatives and obligations, it even more inclusively says: "Agencies of faculty representation, chosen in a manner determined by the faculty, should be provided at each organizational level in the institution concerned. . . . Decisions as to the area and extent of faculty representation and participation in college . . . government should involve the judgment of the faculty. . . ."

However, in the view of many junior college teachers, most, if not all, of these guidelines are at best nearly irrelevant to the community college situation: or, at worst, possibly mischievous or detrimental to the effective operation of the institution. For example, they point out that the basic controlling policy of the community college has long since been established by agencies wholly outside faculty control: by state legislatures or local area boards, reflect-ing the will and intentions of the public at large. This overall policy is, of course, open-door admission for all students who have satisfactorily completed secondary school. It is this single policy decision which determines many other basic policies that must inevitably be followed by the college.

Since, for instance, the numerical growth of the college cannot be controlled by selective admissions screening, the only choice open to it is one of management of numbers, with concomitant lesser decisions involving guidance practices, selection of faculty, organization of increasingly complex chains of command, and the creation of curriculums responsive to the needs and desires of the community served by the college.

One teacher wrote: "Faculty participation in governing this institution has to be, by the very structure of our situation, somewhat limited. Most of us recognize this to be true, and we do not resent it. Here is the background. Ten years ago, we had about 375 students and thirty faculty. This year, we have over 12,000 students and nearly 400 faculty on three different campuses; and the most modest projections for the early 1970's indicate a student population of over 20,000 on five different campuses, all under one administration. So what's happening is, I guess, inevitable: we're getting more and more deans, division heads, department heads (and in a couple of cases, assistant department heads), and the faculty is splintered into groups by subject areas — and now even by separate campuses. More and more, we find ourselves involved only — and I do mean exclusively — with members of our own departments. A simile here would be a series of planets, each with its own cluster of satellites, revolving in larger and larger orbits around the central sun of top administrative structure. If the faculty here are going to have any real impact on the running of this college, we've got to develop a much more efficient system of representative democracy — probably through our division heads."

Commenting on this, another teacher said: "Our situation here is rapidly getting to be the same thing. We've got a terrific president. I don't know of a faculty member who doesn't approve of him. But he's got a kind of Parkinson's Law working against him, especially in the area of intracommunication on this campus. No matter how hard he tries — and he's really working at it — communication is breaking down. We don't feel like a faculty. We only meet as a total group twice a year; and these meetings are largely taken up with details of procedure. Sure, we've got a faculty senate; but a lot of us are not sure how accurately these people represent us, even though we do elect them. A lot of us, I am ashamed to say, don't even know the representatives we vote for. Frankly, nobody has much time to discuss these things with anybody else. As an individual teacher, I feel that I have realistic influence on the college only in my department."

Veteran faculty point out that with the tremendous expansion of the community colleges, more and more faculty are being hired who have only a vague understanding of the philosophy and purposes of such colleges; and whose senior colleagues are typically too pressed and short of time or opportunity to do a properly thorough job of orientation. In practice, of course, this means that large numbers of faculty are concerned in the governing of their colleges only where their own salaries, work conditions, and specific instructional obligations are concerned.

In colleges where the administration has made a conscientious effort to involve instructors in governing the school, by forming standing committees as coordinating mechanisms and as means to educate faculty to wider administrative realities, the individual teacher is, more than not, resentful of the increased burden of committee work, piled on an already heavy teaching schedule. In varying words, many faculty said: "The administration's job is to create conditions where I can do my job—namely, instruct. If they ask me to teach this kind of load, then let them cut my nonteaching duties to an absolute minimum; give me some clerical help; and listen to me and my colleagues when we suggest curriculum revisions, new courses, and more efficient procedures. I want to concentrate on my subject, on my teaching, and on the students for whom I am responsible."

Another facet of the total question of the extent of faculty participation in college governance is the difference in purposes and functions of the community college, as compared to the traditional four-year college, or even the tax-supported state university. We look upon ourselves, say community college teachers, as service organizations — frankly and proudly. We are here to respond to the needs of this community (or this area.) In our vocational-technical programs, for example, our job is to produce employable people; at the same time, giving them as much of a broader education as their circumstances and abilities will permit. As faculty, we want most especially to have a say in how our colleges create and offer programs: this includes their content, methods of presentation, and materials used for instruction. We are less concerned with traditional faculty prerogatives than we are in having a reasonable total context in which we can do a professional job: adequate pay, enough facilities and equipment, reasonable teaching loads, chances for our own professional growth, and an administrative set-up flexible and responsive enough to hear and give weight to our opinions and recommendations. If we, as faculty, have a real functional effect in creating and maintaining this context in our colleges, then we are performing our proper role in sharing in the governing of them.

These statements reflect what could be called a consensus of moderates among faculty interviewed. But there are growing indications that as junior colleges grow in number — and especially in size — faculty militancy concerning its role in college governance will develop in direct proportion to the diminishing of conditions described in the previous paragraph. To the degree, for example, that communication between faculty and administration on an individual campus is such that teachers feel like "mere employees," hedged about with increasing regulations (whether promulgated by the college, the local district, or the state), the response is more likely to be to organize, whether by activation of local chapters of the American Association of University Professors, local units of the American Federation of Teachers, or regional or statewide organizations of junior college instructors, or all of these. The basic purpose of these groups is, or will be, to gain direct hearings with policy-making and legislative bodies.

Though this study, by its very nature, could not make any accurate, in-depth appraisal of causes of faculty militancy, many teachers identified what they believe to be among the basic reasons. Where colleges are governed by district boards which are also responsible for elementary and secondary schools, junior college teachers are vehement in their feelings that their institutions — and by extension, themselves — are shortchanged. They assert, for example, that public school boards are not oriented toward higher education as their main concern, if for no other reason than that the economics and politics of sheer pupil-numbers dictate greater attention to lower school problems. They further state that chief administrators (superintendents in particular) are the ones who recruit and hire junior college administrators; and that they are more than likely to choose persons, who, like themselves, have built their careers in elementary or secondary education. Thus, faculty say, the junior colleges in a situation like this are apt to have imposed attitudes, regulations, and educational philosophies which differ little, if at all, from high schools. Inevitably, the teachers assert, such an atmosphere influences not only courses of study but the level and quality of instruction. They are fond of quoting what is said to be an oft-heard student complaint: "The junior college is nothing but a high school with ash trays."

The basic issue, from the faculty viewpoint, is stated succinctly: "It is illogical to identify junior colleges as institutions of higher education — and then to govern them as appendages to elementary and secondary schools. We believe that it is imperative for junior colleges — in any state — to be governed by independent district boards having no other responsibilities."

* * *

COMMENT: There is wide variance, not only from one geographical area to another, but from institution to institution, in faculty opinion concerning their just or appropriate share in the governing of the college. The range is all the way from indifference ("I don't want to make any policies — that's the administration's job") to active participation in teacher organizations whose avowed aims are to influence legislation affecting them.

The basic fact seems to be that the junior college faculty member can refer to few, if any, precedents in the academic tradition as guides for defining his role in college government. Most faculty, as a result, are feeling their way toward a viable stance in this area.

Historically, junior colleges have been "administrators' colleges." For the most part, program initiation and development, curriculum patterns and offerings, and even (in some cases) the choice of instructional materials, have been decided by deans and presidents; and then faculty have been hired to teach these programs. This was doubtless a natural development, since public junior college administrators would have closest contact with community leaders, for instance, and would therefore best be able to design the local college's offerings to respond to community needs.

However, as individual institutions become more settled and mature, faculty are having increasingly direct relationships with the community, through advisory committees and other mutual working devices. This is especially true in the vocational areas, where local industry, business, and labor groups have a keen and practical interest in the college's offerings; and their associations with the college's teaching staff can be of great mutual benefit. For example, one department head of a vocational program stated proudly, "If one of the industries around here develops new processes and products, we can design and get into our vocational curriculum within thirty days a first-rate course to prepare people for jobs in the new area. We get a hard-working advisory committee made up of representatives from the industry and from our faculty, and together we design the sort of course (or courses) to do the job."

Clearly, in situations of this sort, traditional ideas of the faculty role in college governance need to be rethought.

Professional Affiliations

The junior college instructor apparently does not want or see the need for special organizations in his discipline or field. (There are qualifications to this statement which will be noted later.) Rather, he is most anxious to be accepted as a colleague by those already existing professional groups whose membership may at this time be largely drawn from four-year college and university teachers. Again and again, such sentiments as these were expressed:

"If we belong in the mainstream of higher education — and I think we do — then we should make our contributions to (as well as derive benefits from) professional organizations in our fields. And I would hope that we would not simply be 'junior college wings' of these groups, but be accepted as equals. We do, after all, have something significant to share about lower level instruction."

Or: "No, I don't want to see any 'Junior College Historical Association,' or whatever. I want the stimulation of being with those who know more than I do. I need the wider perspective, and I wouldn't get it if junior college people just organized to talk to themselves."

Opinion in this area was surprisingly uniform.

However, practical problems were most often named as deterrents to effective affiliation with national professional groups or societies. "Time and money, time and money," said one teacher with exasperation. "Here's an annual meeting in Chicago, and I'm in California, and the administration tells me that there is no money to pay my expenses. I sure can't afford it on my own. And they ask me who is going to 'cover' my classes for four days. So I don't go. And I honestly think that this college, and especially my students, would benefit from having a teacher who had been able to get out of this backwater, even briefly, to see what's going on. Sure, I can read the proceedings of the meeting six months later. But it's not like being there and talking with people."

Again, this statement, or variants of it, were typical. Yet, there seemed to be little or no disposition on the part of college administrations to deny their instructors opportunities to attend appropriate professional conferences. One dean of instruction pointed out that he and the president encouraged faculty to attend appropriate meetings. "But we are allowed to reimburse them only for travel within the state," he said, "and even these allowances are unrealistically low. I think the answer here is to persuade our (district) board to allocate a discretionary fund to the president, and it should be substantial enough for us to determine faculty requests for conference attendance on their individual merits — both for the teacher and for the benefit of the college as a whole."

Despite the apparent lack of desire of teachers to form special junior college professional groups (particularly in individual disciplines), there is some evidence that such organizations will, in fact, develop — particularly where two-year instructors feel that the established national or regional organizations do not satisfy their needs. Here again, the problem is one of adequate communication. If enough junior college faculty members feel "cut off," so to speak, from the mainstream of their own discipline, they will eventually establish an organization of their own, regionally or even nationally. It is more than likely, too, as the numbers of junior college teachers increase, that they will establish both their own professional groups and retain affiliations with already existing ones.

(It is appropriate to suggest here that existing professional associations have right now a splendid opportunity to involve their junior college colleagues — and some groups are already effectively doing so. But if junior college teachers are treated as "second cousins," in effect, then this growing and vital segment of the teaching community will almost certainly splinter off to form its own groups.)

Junior College Teaching AS A PERMANENT CAREER

Any assumption that junior college teachers are simply frustrated four-year college instructors who "could not make the grade" must, as far as the findings of this study can determine, be labeled as a myth.

The often-heard paraphrase of Shaw, "Those who can, teach in a four-year college; those who cannot, settle for the junior college," is simply not true.

Those who have chosen two-year college teaching have, of course, done so for many reasons — some personal, some professional — but rarely has the choice been made as "second best."

Indeed, overwhelming testimony reflects the words of one instructor who said, "This kind of teaching is one of the most exciting challenges in higher education right now. Frankly, I feel like a damn pioneer. Look what we get here in the way of students: S.A.T. scores all the way from the low 200's to the high 700's, for instance. A lot of them are *really* motivated, too — though certainly not all! They suddenly realize that this is their last chance, so to speak, at further education; and even if they're 'dumb,' in the usual academic sense, they're *ready* for instruction, and this makes them worth working hard with."

Another remarked: "I sometimes have to laugh at my friends in four-year colleges. They get students all screened — often just the top half of high school kids, well prepared. They don't have to *teach* so much as just open up some doors. But if they got what I do — well, they'd start to redefine the verb 'teach,' and that's for certain."

In fact, the general impression of the attitude of these instructors toward their teaching was that they felt a kind of exhilaration in the face of unprecedented challenge. This was particularly true in newly founded colleges, where the sense of "pioneering" was almost palpable. It was hard to escape the feeling on several campuses that the faculty was made up of an enthusiastic group of mavericks who both resisted and even resented the usual academic parade; who saw unique opportunities for redesigning the whole pattern of freshman-sophomore instruction. One teacher said, "I prefer this situation. I've got a Ph.D. — but who wants the usual rat-race when he can have this? I don't feel a bit inadequate for four-year college teaching. In fact, I've done it. And I got out because *real* teaching is what I wanted — and I certainly am getting it here." Then he added, with a grin, "It's rugged, and make no mistake: big classes, an enormous range of abilities in the students. But as a teacher, I've either got to put up or shut up — and I find this exciting."

For many instructors, especially in or near urban areas, teaching in the local community college is both a convenience and the satisfaction of a long-standing desire. (This was particularly true of qualified women whose husbands worked in the area.) One vocational instructor described his affiliation with the local community college this way: "I always wanted to teach. But after I got a B.S. at ——— University, I went with the ——— plant here as an electronics engineer. Then they started the junior college, and I looked into it. The college needed somebody like me. They took my eleven years of experience as more than equivalent to advanced degrees. I took a cut in salary, of course, but I'm happier teaching than I ever was at the plant."

Another, a woman, said: "My husband is a lawyer in town. I have a perfectly good Ivy League M.A., and now that my children are grown, I find teaching here is a tremendous satisfaction."

There seems little disposition on the part of most community college instructors to view their situation as merely a stepping-stone to a four-year college teaching job. "Give me the right kind of teaching conditions," most of them say, in effect, "and this *is* my career." Without disparaging four-year colleges, many teachers were frank to say that one of the attractive aspects of the junior college was its relative freedom from the pressure to achieve advanced degrees, publication, and "academic status," in the usual sense. For instance, many teachers said, in effect, "I would much rather have had two — or even three — broad-gauged, one-year master's degrees in areas allied to my main discipline, than one doctorate. In any case, I worry less about the letters after my name than I do about working with the material that will enrich my teaching in this particular situation."

A further strong motive in many teachers for making a career of two-year college instruction was the service aspect of the community college, as it related to its surrounding area. There was often expressed an almost missionary feeling about the functions of the college as they might serve to lift the whole cultural and economic level of the total community. A vocational teacher said: "I feel that in a real way, I am a public servant — and I'm proud of it. I've lived here all my life, and this community has been good to me. Teaching here at the college gives me a way to help another generation of young people have some of the chances that were given to me."

The major reservation to commitment to career-teaching at the two-year level was — as detailed elsewhere in this report — the concern of faculty that opportunities for continued professional growth would either be limited or nonexistent. "You don't make a career out of repeating yourself," said several faculty, "and we are concerned that, despite all the good will in the world, this headlong effort just to keep up with the pressure of numbers will postpone real, practical attention to us as honest-to-goodness career people. You can get pretty stale by teaching the same courses at the same level for several years in a row, if you don't have a chance for real refreshment."

It is important to emphasize, in summary, that faculty accept the idea of junior college teaching as a permanent career with the qualification that the colleges in which they work (and will be working) will provide, increasingly, a context, resources, and assistance which will enable them to experience continued professional growth and stimulation. They do not expect that "administration" will automatically provide them with such a context — indeed, they want to be active partners in the planning of it. But they point out, reasonably, that unless the junior college can offer prospective instructors a climate of true professionalism, it will be increasingly difficult to attract first-rate people to teaching positions in these institutions; and even more difficult to hold them if they do come.

* * *

COMMENT: Looking to the future, the consideration of junior college teaching as a permanent career by those young people now in college and graduate school is going to depend, in great measure, upon the knowledge and understanding of junior colleges on the part of senior college and university faculty — and particularly graduate faculties. Yet, with some scattered exceptions, such needful understanding is markedly lacking. The "image" of the junior college, in the eyes of most graduate faculty, is that of a second-rate or stop-gap institution, not "really" higher education, catering to the academically marginal student, and employing teachers who are not "good enough" to be "regular" college or university faculty. There is, it must be said, a tincture of arrogance in such attitudes. (Junior college teachers, incidentally, feel this attitude and its accompanying patronizing, and they resent it deeply).

Realistically, however, university graduate faculties do have a primary obligation to produce scholars — particularly Ph.D.'s — and it is understandable that their first emphasis is on the identification and nurture of their best students for this purpose. It is blatantly obvious, on the other hand, that not every good student is a good Ph.D. candidate, and that many of these, given solid, non-research-oriented graduate training, would make first-rate instructors, either for junior colleges or for the freshman-sophomore level of four-year colleges. If graduate faculties and also undergraduate faculties could, in effect, "be educated" to the real opportunities open to many of their students in lower-level college teaching, it is likely that many more gifted young people would consider junior college teaching as a permanent career.

The other side of this coin must also be clearly pointed out. As one graduate dean said, "Just what does the junior college have to offer my people professionally?" The question is apt and fair. It asks the junior colleges, individually and collectively, to make a clear-cut case for themselves as institutions offering professional challenge and opportunities for growth to those who aim to teach there.

High on the priority list for junior colleges is the obligation to take the initiative in establishing means of real communication ("face-to-face work," as one dean called it) with graduate faculties — especially those in the several disciplines — so that mutual education as to needs, resources, and common interests can take place. Whatever the means to do this, whether by conferences on a national level, working meetings of deans and faculties from both kinds of institutions, statewide or even locally, there is little doubt that it must be done, consistently, and over a long period of time.

Guidance — A Faculty Viewpoint

With a few exceptions, junior college faculty express more than a little dissatisfaction with the guidance given to students, both in the high schools and in their own institutions. In the minds of too many high school principals and guidance departments, these teachers state, the junior college still has a poor image. Too often, the attitude seems to be, "Well, if you can't get into a four-year college, you'll have to settle for a junior college." Further, too few secondary school counselors have adequate knowledge of the curriculums even of the junior colleges within their own nearby areas. Junior college faculty are emphatic in urging closer and more continuous liaison between their own colleges and the schools which send them students.

But where junior college guidance departments take the initiative, faculty are quick to praise the results. "For the last two years," said one, "our guidance people have been making regular information visits to the high schools in ——— County. It's very plain to us now that students are being more sensibly placed and more realistically advised about their career aims. Obviously, this saves much confusion here, too, especially in course placement."

Where there was criticism of their own guidance operations, most faculty identified the root problem as "poor communication" between the teaching and guidance staffs. More specifically, for example, faculty were concerned that those in student personnel were too often uninformed — in the detail necessary — about the course of study, the various "tracks" (transfer, terminal), and changes in curriculum. One division head (science) made it a regular practice to screen all students a second time to make sure of appropriate placement. "For instance," he said, "we have a transfer physics course and a terminal physics course — or rather one which is more practically tied in with our vocational offerings. The transfer course requires a good math background, while the other one takes much less. But time and again, our guidance people listen to a student who has unrealistic ambitions about transfer and assign him to the transfer physics course — even though his high school math record, if he had any significant math at all, would practically guarantee failure. So I have just taken to doing the job myself, with some help from my staff."

Course registration time, especially at the start of each semester, is crucial, faculty point out, and it is often at this point that guidance procedures break down. One teacher, who is also a part-time counselor in a college of about 9,000 students, said: "Now you take the beginning of the September period. There were seven people on the regular guidance staff, and eleven of us brought in to help. But that meant 18 people to process 4,500 students in barely two days. Obviously, this is ridiculous, because we didn't have either the time or the people to do a thoughtful job of assigning students to appropriate courses. Even the IBM machine downstairs wasn't much help — all it could tell us was how many sections of what were filled up."

Incidentally, faculty do make a clear distinction between "guidance" (student placement, mainly) and "counseling" (work with student personal and career problems). Teachers are far more approving of the effectiveness of the counseling actions than they are of the guidance (placement) functions of their guidance departments.

* * *

COMMENT: Further elaboration here is not necessary, since a recent and deeply significant study of this whole area explores it in detail. The report of the study, a two-year project under the auspices of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, is entitled, *Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development.* The blunt conclusion of this careful, wide-ranging report, is stated in its foreword: "Student personnel programs in community colleges are woefully inadequate."

Additionally, also, the report presents detailed recommendations for upgrading personnel services.

It is not too strong an assertion to say that this study, with its clear identification of guidance deficiencies and its explicit recommendations for improvement, should be an operational guide for every junior college administrator in the country.

(Copies of the report may be obtained, at $5 each, from the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.)

Faculty Rank

Teacher opinion concerning a professional ranking system was thoroughly mixed, though the consensus seemed to be toward *no* rank — with all teachers simply called "instructors." If feelings about the matter can be loosely divided into two camps, it was perhaps the liberal arts instructors who expressed more concern about establishing a system of rank than did their colleagues in the vocational and technical fields.

Three main reasons were advanced in favor of faculty ranking: (1) that it gives a certain increment of status when junior college faculty relate to their four-year colleagues; (2) that the notation of rank confers some "prestige" in the eyes of students; (3) and, not least, that rank and pay are inseparable.

The arguments against rank generally were: (1) "Everybody wants to be a chief — so where are the Indians?" (2) "If the junior college is, as claimed, a unique institution, why do we have to copy the traditional forms, just for status purposes?" (3) "The whole touchy problem of teacher-evaluation is involved — and who does the evaluating, and by what standards?" (4) "You know, to call myself an associate professor of spot welding is a bit ridiculous." (5) "This campus has been all churned up about the rank business for three years. Most of us can't see what we'd really gain by having it."

* * *

COMMENT: In the minds of most of the teachers who responded to this idea of ranking, the basic question seemed to be: What real functions would rank serve? (Other usual measures of academic merit — research, publication, scholarly honors — are not applicable, in the main, to junior college instructors. Many of them felt that a ranking system would be simply a poorly disguised "merit pay" device. Others commented that simple longevity of service would eventually bring a "full professorship," and would therefore make the honorific meaningless.

For the most part, the reality seems to be that if working conditions are good, salary levels are adequate, opportunities for professional development are available, then the whole question of rank is seen as largely irrelevant.

Preparation of Teachers

As a wide generalization, those teachers most satisfied with their preparation for junior college instruction were those in the vocational areas since, as many of them pointed out, considerable work experience was required of them as a condition of employment by the college. On the other hand, liberal arts instructors (including many in the sciences) were inclined to be critical of their graduate work as "inadequate" or "inappropriate" or "not especially relevant" to the teaching situations in two-year colleges. The most general criticism was that graduate courses are too often slanted toward the needs of the prospective Ph.D., both in content and in treatment.

"When I go back to take a graduate course," said one history teacher, "I want plenty of content, naturally; there are still lots of holes in my background. But it would be most useful to me if the courses put less stress on research and more on concepts — and even suggested methods of teaching — appropriate to instructing freshmen and sophomores. I don't quite know how to be more specific. But I know that a lot of us would like to sit down with some graduate school people and work this out."

(There is general agreement that the Ph.D. is not necessary for junior college teaching. It is recognized and respected as a research degree; but it represents a depth and manner of training rarely required of junior college faculty.)

Few instructors had had specific preparation for junior college teaching. In discussing whether graduate programs for such preparation would be desirable, the consensus was definite that they would be: but the emphasis was on *freshman-sophomore level* instruction, rather than on "junior college teaching" *per se.* They indicated, for example, that especially in the liberal arts and elementary sciences, junior college course offerings were apt to be generalized: surveys (of literature, for instance); coverage of basic concepts, with allied laboratory work, in the general sciences; elementary or intermediate language study; and the like. "Teaching a survey course effectively is one of the roughest jobs there is," said one social science teacher, "to say nothing of finding adequate texts to use. I don't especially approve of 'how to' graduate courses; but I could have used one in How and What to Teach in Sophomore Beginning Sociology." In varying ways, his comment was repeated by many.

There was far less negative criticism of university graduate schools, however, than there was the often-stated and almost wistful desire for practical on-going cooperation with them. Most faculty saw the key and initial step as one of liaison between junior college and university, particularly as the latter could come to know the problems and needs of the former. In some junior colleges, of course, this initiative has already been taken by individual faculties and administrations. But, in general, teachers say, two-year college and university collaboration needs to be far more detailed and regularized than it now typically is.

Preparation of New Teachers: Junior college liberal arts teachers seem fairly in agreement about the kind of preparation needed for new teachers, especially in the humanities: a "solid" baccalaureate followed by a broad-based master's degree of at least a year and a summer; or, even better, a sixteen-month to two-year M.A. working with naturally linked subject areas (such as sociology-anthropology, or history-political science); or a master of arts in teaching (similar to — but richer than — ones now offered by some universities, where there is not only concentration on subject matter, but a modicum of supervised teaching experience and brief exposure to the history of education and educational psychology. Many teachers spoke of their need for "a good course in adolescent psychology — one dealing frankly and directly with the kinds of problems we meet on campuses like these."

As in so many other areas, the junior college instructors emphasized flexibility and freedom from rigid requirements, especially in post-baccalaureate study, for prospective two-year college teachers. "Far better, I think," said one department head, "for a graduate student headed for this sort of teaching to do many careful term papers than one 'research' thesis — just to give you one example of what I mean by 'flexibility.' " Another instructor said, "In our situation (a large urban area with two universities) it would be a good idea to set up a brief course, maybe a semester, where some of us in the junior college could team-teach with graduate faculty a course called 'Junior College Teaching: Its Nature and Problems,' or something like that. It would make good orientation for prospective teachers. And also it would help the university people come a bit closer to the realities of our situation, too."

* * *

COMMENT: (The following comments refer mainly to the liberal arts and sciences, rather than to the technical-vocational fields.)

At the present time, the basic acceptable preparation for junior college teachers seems to be the master's degree: The B.A. or B.S., plus 30 hours of credit, mainly in content, rather than in education or methods courses.

But desirable preparation (i.e., most useful, or "best") as described — or inferred — by many faculty would have in it elements not now offered in M.A., or even M.A.T. programs. Adequately accomplished, these elements would require a post-baccalaureate period of study ranging from sixteen months to two years.

Academic content: A minimum of ten courses (or equivalent) in the subject discipline *at the graduate level.* Undergraduate courses with "added work" for graduate students taking them were not thought to be satisfactory. Main reason: the level of class discourse would not be sufficiently mature for advanced students. Of these ten courses, half should be, to the degree possible, *interdisciplinary* in content and in instruction. (Examples: biology-zoology-botany; sociology-psychology-anthropology; literature-art-music; history-political science-cultural anthropology; geography-geology-ecology.) Teachers felt that the interdisciplinary approach would (1) provide the necessary broader knowledge base for later teaching of general courses at the freshman-sophomore level; (2) diminish the research emphasis; (3) help the prospective teacher to have a more-than-usually flexible approach to materials and methods of instruction. Nothing in their recommendations suggested any water-down of the quality of the graduate work; indeed, the emphasis was that the suggested approaches would be more *rigorous* in many ways than traditional graduate courses.

Supervised Teaching Experience: At least one quarter, and preferably a full semester, of actual teaching responsibility in a nearby cooperating junior college, with at least two preparations. This was not conceived of as "practice teaching," in its traditional sense. Rather, it was described as a *bona fide* internship, with supervision and counsel both from appropriate university faculty and veteran junior college faculty in the discipline. (Recommendations as to the timing of the intern experience varied, though the consensus was for second semester.) At the same time the graduate student was doing his intern teaching, he would also continue to take courses, though on a reduced load, in his field.

Professional Seminar: Rather than separate course offerings in educational philosophy, educational psychology, and methods of teaching (English, or whatever), teachers generally recommended what could be considered a continuing professional seminar, involving *all* graduate students, from whatever discipline, who were undertaking this "enriched master's degree" for prospective teachers. As a basic pattern, the professional seminar would meet for two hours every other week through the entire span of the graduate program. It would have its own syllabus of appropriate reading material, including recognized works on the history of education, the nature of the learning process, the psychology (and problems) of students, the nature of teaching, and the like. Ideally, the seminar would be led by carefully prepared teams of graduate professors and veteran junior college instructors, or master teachers.

Degree recognition: Most teachers making these recommendations felt strongly that no "new" degree was needed for such a program. Rather, they asserted that it would "make the M.A. respectable again." They suggested that, in addition to the awarding of the M.A. itself, certificates of internship experience and completion of professional seminar could be added to the candidate's dossier.

Such a program as outlined has a number of distinct advantages to recommend it:

1. It is open-ended. A successful completion of such a program would not hinder an interested student from going right on for a Ph.D. if he wished, since his thirty hours of course work would more than likely be acceptable to most graduate departments.
2. It could conceivably be completed in a summer-academic year-summer pattern, thus reducing a student's financial commitments.
3. Such preparation would, in most areas, make him a desirable candidate for a junior college faculty.

Faculty AND THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Though the American Association of Junior Colleges is the single national organization representing and serving most of the two-year colleges in the United States, few faculty know much about it: the services it offers member institutions, the information and assistance it supplies (through publications, consultants, and the like), and the projects and activities which it sponsors. Many faculty see *The Junior College Journal* "occasionally — when a copy happens to turn up in the faculty lounge;" but more often than not, the *Journal* goes to administrators, is read by them, and then "sent to a file in the library, where it gets buried." Indeed, some faculty have not even heard of the Association, to say nothing of reading its publications.

The faulty communication here — if, indeed faulty is the proper word — clearly has its root in the fact that the Association has been, and largely still is, an "administrator's organization," to use a faculty term for it. Since membership in the AAJC is primarily institutional, it has been natural for colleges to be represented by presidents and deans. Further, though this report is not the appropriate place to comment further on the point, faculty who know about the Association are only slightly aware — if they are aware at all — of the relatively limited funding which supports the Association's activities and staff work. Many times, the comment was made, "Why doesn't the Association (AAJC) *do* something about ————," and then would be mentioned suggestions already stated in this report, or listed with the recommendations in the final section. It is probably significant, too, that faculty were far less inclined to find "fault" with the Association than to wish, or hope, that the Association could initiate more projects and services for faculty benefit than have hitherto been possible.

Brief Summary and Interpretation

It is plain that junior college faculty have yet to attain full professional identity or status. Their position in higher education is unclear; and its definition will probably take a number of years to evolve. The institutions in which they serve are so varied in aims and functions that traditional criteria and labels as applied to college teachers are neither applicable nor accurate, in the main. The whole field of post-high school education has changed so radically in the past two decades, and is expanding with such prodigious speed, that time-hardened academic customs and attitudes, as they relate to junior college faculty, are not only largely irrelevant, they may even be downright misleading. For example, a faculty of a large, "comprehensive" public college is hardly a "community of scholars," as many college and university faculties are still wishfully prone to describe themselves. It is not to denigrate junior college teachers to say that "scholarship," in the usually accepted sense, is neither their mandate nor their goal. For the most part, their scholarship is directed toward the enrichment of their teaching, and is not an end in itself. Thus, to develop any programs for the assistance of junior college faculty on the assumption that their situation conforms in general to that of their four-year college colleagues would be to miss the mark almost entirely.

Or, as more and more community colleges are developed or expanded, there is an increasing imperative to think through afresh the nature and problems of the academic activity of a commuting population where, in essence, the ebb and flow of hundreds and thousands of students is perhaps more of a prime reality than their comparatively brief daily presence in classroom, laboratory, or workshop. The very fluidity of the situation requires a new set of assumptions, from top administration to individual teacher.

The mandate of the junior college — especially the public institutions — is to "mean many things to many people." This is no idle assertion: it amounts almost to a creed; and it certainly is a broad statement of policy, implying openness, flexibility, and service. At the same time, the very sweeping nature of the mandate is a source of confusion. The junior college is certainly going someplace — and in a hurry. But where? Many faculty members are unsure even of the aims and purposes of their own individual colleges.

"This place," said one, "reminds me of Stephen Leacock's famous line: 'He mounted his horse and galloped off in all directions.' Now take my situation. I've been here three years. I'm teaching English. But am I teaching the *right* things, the *needed* things, the *essential* things — I mean for these students? My flunk-out per cent was 27 per cent last semester. Maybe I'm a lousy teacher. Maybe they're lousy students. Maybe both. But my real question is: how do I adapt my individual efforts to the aims of this college? And when you poke into the business of 'aims,' you get fog, jargon, catalog talk, and 'service to students.' Well, the best 'service' I can be to a student is to teach him something *useful:* how to write a clear sentence, or how to read a paragraph and understand what it means. I'm not being flippant when I say those are *real* accomplishments, and they take time to teach and learn. But my syllabus makes me 'teach' bits and pieces of literature, composition 'forms,' and even some poetry. These are fine; but are they what I should be teaching?"

The same question, adapted in emphasis to every discipline, and to technical and vocational fields as well, was asked again and again: are we teaching the right things? How do we know that we are? How do we increase the sheer efficiency of our instruction? Exactly what is this college set up to do — and what is my (the teacher's) contribution to these defined aims?

A further source of confusion, some faculty reported ironically, was the very groups which might be presumed to be clarifying agencies: namely, accrediting boards and associations in the various regions. "These people are still using either old criteria or four-year college and university criteria on us," one department chairman said. "And far too often — in my experience, I've only seen one — there isn't a single junior college faculty member on an accrediting team. They're all presidents and deans. So, they've got a special viewpoint. And, frankly, these guys are sometimes prone to scratch one another's backs where accreditation is concerned."

At one college, a teacher remarked, "You know what we're doing here — I think? We're creating programs to meet accreditation criteria — instead of building the programs we know these students need."

As previously mentioned, too, the student-centered attitude of the two-year colleges has broad implications for the future effectiveness of faculty. The attitude may, or may not, be laudable (this report is no place to make a judgment); but there is no doubt that it is time-consuming, and thus, not so eventually, expensive. Not the least part of the expense is the reduction of time and opportunities for teachers to keep themselves refreshed and up-to-date in their own disciplines.

Yet the junior college teacher urgently and legitimately wants to be accepted as being "in higher education." He is not simply a teacher of grades thirteen and fourteen, though in numerous administrative contexts he is treated as one. He deals with college-age students; and, in addition, with adults from twenty to seventy years of age in evening divisions of his college. He works with college-level material. Particularly in vocational and technical fields, his aim is (must be) thoroughly pragmatic: the teaching of marketable skills. And also, in one sense, most liberal arts instruction partakes of the same pragmatism, namely, the production of transferable students. If these statements sound either nonacademic or undignified, one has only to spend a few frank hours with faculty to accept their accuracy.

In these, and many other respects, the situation of the junior college teacher is new. Solutions of his problems, and resolutions of issues affecting him, then, must be newly conceived and even boldly unorthodox.

But unfortunately, it does not seem likely that the fresh, truly innovative thinking required is going to come from junior college administrators. Indeed, it is hardly too strong a statement to assert that the chief problem of the junior college teacher is, in its broadest sense, the often too-restrictive regulatory context in which he and his immediate administrators do their work. And, by extension, the major issue facing junior college instruction staffs in the future will be the growing shortage of trained, experienced, imaginative leadership, from presidents down to department heads, and assistant department heads. This shortage is already acute — a fact both recognized and worriedly admitted by outstanding junior college leaders across the country.

Indeed, the situation can be fairly compared to that of the Armed Services in the months preceding and following Pearl Harbor in 1941, when an enormous cadre of non-commissioned officers and junior officers had to be developed quickly to train and lead the hundreds of thousands of drafted troops flooding into camps. In many respects, this is an appropriate parallel. For example, a daily reading of newspaper clippings referring to junior colleges about the country reveals stories of bond issues enpassed, new colleges opened — invariably with larger enrollments than predicted, and temporary buildings rented and hastily refurbished to accommodate overflow classes. This editorial, for example, is typical:

> *The library is not yet open, the cafeteria is still not finished, the book store is in a temporary home, but —— County's new junior college has already earned itself a place that is anything but temporary or incomplete.*
>
> *Classes open today at the ———— Campus for some 4,300 students, a far larger group than was expected by county voters when they approved creation of the junior college. The large enrollment speaks eloquently of the*

> *gap that the school will fill in a day when education is the best investment in the future a community can make.*
>
> *(The president of the board of trustees) predicts that by 1975 as many as 40,000 students will be attending classes at ——— and six suburban campuses. The prediction is not hard to believe . . .*

The sheer management of numbers alone is a staggering administrative task. Add to this, the creation of academic and vocational programs; the recruitment, orientation, and continued training of teaching and supporting staffs; and the assurance (to say nothing of the continuance) of quality instruction; and the measure of the administrative mandate can begin to be taken. It is true, of course, that top administrative talent is in chronic short supply in any endeavor. But with the hopes and expectations of the public for their junior colleges, and the hundreds of millions of dollars voted and annually authorized for these institutions, it would be an educational disaster for many of them to turn out to be, in effect, weeding-out stations for those unable to attend four-year colleges, or "intellectual baby-sitters," as some teachers have remarked, or second-rate learning experiences for those tens of thousands of potentially able students who, for economic reasons mainly, need the junior college to continue their education.

The key to quality in the junior colleges, as of course in any schools, is the skilled, fully professional teacher. Most especially, at this point in the development of the junior college, his needs, the problems he identifies as pressing, require first priority and continued, urgent attention from his administrators, from the boards who allocate funds for the colleges, from his own immediate administrators, and — eventually — from the public which pays the bills and is expecting the benefits of the educational opportunities provided by these institutions.

* * *

A final word. This study has been a preliminary investigation. If its findings are even partially valid, it poses some vexing and wide-ranging questions which urgently require attention and increasing dialogue among all segments of the educational community.

In the recommendations that follow, suggestions are made which may provide a framework for a beginning strategy to achieve this dialogue. The recommendations necessarily are sketched in outline: they are intended as possible starting points, not as blueprints for fully developed action programs. For the most part, these are derived either directly from faculty recommendations; or they have been developed from the implications of repeated faculty statements.

Section Three: 3

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION PROGRAMS

2. AN AGENDA OF BASIC QUESTIONS FOR COLLEGES

Recommendations for Action

1. *A National Committee for Junior College Faculty:* This should be a group of outstanding individuals, with its membership drawn from four-year colleges and universities and from two-year colleges, with key academic disciplines particularly represented. Its members should be persons of national stature, so that statements made by the committee would command respect and attention from all segments of education.

The committee, comprising not more than twelve members, should be in the nature of a task force, to address itself for eighteen months to two years, especially to the problems of the preparation and professional refreshment of two-year college teachers.

Among matters that could be on the working agenda of the committee are the following:

a. Develop guidelines for graduate work appropriate to the training of teachers

b. Create patterns for special institutes, seminars, and conferences for the continuing professional refreshment and upgrading of faculty

c. Develop recommendations pertaining to faculty load, problems of instruction inherent in the teaching of large groups, effective organization of academic departments, and similar matters

d. Examine the range of professional organizations and their relationships to junior college faculty

e. Be the sponsoring committee for special workshop meetings organized to attack specific problems.

Staff work for the committee could be provided by the American Association of Junior Colleges.

2. *More Effective Dialogue:* (a) among junior college faculties; (b) among faculty members in particular disciplines; (c) between teachers and administrators; (d) between junior colleges and four-year institutions. Some devices (or methods) suggested by faculty were the following:

3. *Summer Institutes, Workshops, or Seminars:* The most persistent faculty request was for the establishment of four-to-six week summer programs (available regionally) where teachers in allied disciplines could study, discuss, and share problems and materials of freshman-sophomore instruction. (These were urgently suggested in addition to available opportunities through the National Science Foundation, for example, or other agencies.) The basic pattern of such summer institutes, as faculty describe them, should be such that attendance would be supported by travel and subsistence allowances sufficient to allow them to "break even." (Most funding suggestions wistfully pointed toward "foundations.")

Faculty were both urgent and explicit in hoping that such summer opportunities could be designed by "people who know our needs," staffed by the best talent available, both from the junior colleges and from the universities. The main thrust of the request was for vastly increased opportunities for professional refreshment.

4. *Workshops for Junior College Administrators:* Many faculty saw the need for brief (one-two weeks) but intensive seminars for two-year college administrators: presidents, deans, and most especially, subadministrators (division and department heads) for the analysis and discussion of practical administrative problems of junior colleges, particularly as these affect faculty.

5. *Information Clearinghouse:* A national clearinghouse of information on new curriculum patterns, teaching innovations, special materials of instruction, and many similar matters within areas of faculty interest, was suggested by many teachers.

6. *A National Job Clearinghouse:* Faculty are acutely aware of their lack of knowledge of job opportunities in junior colleges throughout the country. They feel strongly that a central clearinghouse, computerized and adequately staffed, is immediately necessary, not only for their own mobility, but for the recruitment and proper placement of the thousands of new teachers and administrators shortly to be required by junior colleges. They are aware of the large-scale funding that such an enterprise would require. But, they point out, the almost immediate savings in recruitment-and-placement effort would more than repay such an investment.

7. *Liaison with Graduate Schools:* Effective liaison with major graduate schools throughout the country was seen by many faculty as a national problem, transcending the particular efforts (no matter how effective) of individual junior colleges and single universities. Such liaison included assistance in developing courses and programs for the needs of practicing junior college teachers; preparation of those intending to teach in junior colleges; and closer understanding by senior institutions of the special situations and needs of junior colleges, especially in the areas of student transfers, adequate credits for two-year college teachers taking refresher courses, and the like.

No single pattern for academic preparation of prospective faculty was suggested, though there was general agreement that the kind of "enriched" master's degree program, as outlined on pages 72-76, would be desirable. The emphasis, always, was on flexibility in graduate offerings, with special attention given to course work and materials applicable to freshman-sophomore level instruction.

8. *Liaison with Junior College Faculty Organizations:* Similarly, local, state, and regional junior college teacher organizations spoke of the need for assistance in coordination of their efforts.

9. *Task Forces for Particular Problems:* In a number of problem areas, faculty suggested that the American Association of Junior Colleges take the initiative to organize and generally coordinate task force groups (both

nationally and regionally) for two-day workshop meetings —mainly for the development of guideline recommendations. Mentioned most often were:

a. The problem of "equivalent experience" in a prospective teacher's background or preparation. The equivalency factors varied, of course, from discipline to discipline; but faculty believed that a representative task force of teachers and deans of instruction could make useful analysis and recommendations in this area.

b. A combined task force of graduate school faculty (from the disciplines) and junior college faculty to make recommendations concerning teacher preparation.

c. A selected group of faculty from colleges known to be making innovations in instruction, to pool their experiences and publish their findings in a special pamphlet for wide distribution to junior colleges around the country.

d. A task force to design model orientation programs for new faculty; in-service programs for continuing faculty. (This would probably require two task forces, and perhaps longer than a two-day workshop.)

The agenda could, of course, be multiplied.

10. *Center for Junior College Studies:* A central, creative strategy for attacking these, and other problems was suggested by a number of teachers and administrators. This was the creation of an autonomous Center for Junior College Studies (similar in general to the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies), where some of the most competent persons in the junior college movement (or those involved with it) could be given time and resources to study the problems of two-year colleges and develop programs for their long-range solution. Among other mandates for such a center could be the following: (a) study of curriculum patterns; (b) assembly and analysis of new or advanced methods of subject presentation; (c) modes or patterns for faculty in-service programs; (d) development of cross-disciplinary studies at the freshman-sophomore level; (e) professional seminars on a regular basis for practicing two-year college teachers, focusing especially on pedagogical problems posed by students of less-than-average ability; (f) observation and critical analysis of practice teaching (with cooperation from near-

by junior colleges and universities); (g) compilation and organizing for effective retrieval of past and current research relating to teaching practices, innovations, experiments; (h) studies of professional standards and recommendations relating to these; (i) acting as a conference center on an as-needed basis for two-year college administrators and/or faculty needing the resources of such a center.

Many other possibilities suggest themselves. But the idea of such a center is to be a point of creative infection for junior colleges across the country. One faculty member, a department head, stated, "We need a place where the best minds (faculty or administration) can come together, without distractions or pressures, to do some real thinking and planning for the future of this (junior college) movement . . . We need what could be called a 'Think Tank.' "

* * *

COMMENT: The junior college movement has a core of senior statesmen, some of whom could be said to be the "fathers" of the modern junior college. There is a cadre — unhappily too small — of extremely able and even brilliant people who are presidents and deans of individual institutions, public and private, around the country. There are a number — again, too few — of faculty who, as they mature in the field, are able to think about the junior college in broader and deeper perspective than their own classroom, institution, or discipline. (It is probably natural, though perhaps unfortunate, that such teachers almost invariably become administrators, thus draining the best people from the classroom.)

But it is not an exaggeration to say that the "good ones" are literally too busy to do much strategic and even philosophical thinking about the junior college — and especially about the kind and direction of its future development. One college president, speaking for many, said wistfully, "A significant part of my job should be, frankly, to put my feet up and stare out the window and think about this college; and other colleges like this one. I need to think about where we're going, and why. I need to deepen and develop my own philosophy of this kind of education, because obviously such a philosophy is one day going to be translated into active terms at this college, if not at others, too. But I don't have the time — or the place — to do this. I would guess that every president I know would say substantially this same thing."

Here, again, the situation described by this president is probably endemic in higher education. But it has serious implications for the future development of the junior college. Is the movement to be simply a kind of reflexive response to immediate needs? What are the implications of its explosive development? What should be the nature of its future service to the community; to its future students? What direction is the development taking? Who is doing the long-range, broadly inclusive thinking, planning for whole congeries of junior colleges that are springing into being? (Some of this, to be sure, is being done in state offices; in a few university centers; by some regional groups.) But an educational system that will comprise within less than a decade more than a thousand colleges, serving at least half — if not more than half — of *all* students in higher education, would be well served by the kind of center or institute suggested in this recommendation.

A Brief Agenda of Basic Questions

There are a number of fundamental questions posed, either directly or by implication, in a report of this kind. Some of these are general, open-ended, and not really susceptible to "answers," in any explicit sense. Others are more specific, and operational answers either are being found, or can be found. The questions, in no special order of priority, are listed here mainly as sample bases for the kind of discussion that junior college faculty have indicated as both necessary and desirable:

1. In what ways is teaching in the junior college (particularly in the comprehensive, publicly supported, community college) significantly different from instruction at the freshman-sophomore level in four-year colleges and

universities? If there are such differences, how are they identified? Do they demand methods of instruction markedly different from traditional ones? Is adequate action research being undertaken in the problems of larger-group instruction (other than the use of television, for example)?

2. Is the organization of the college such that communication among groups (particularly board of trustees-administration-faculty-students) is swift, accurate, and flexible? Are there alternate (or additional) modes of internal structuring of the organization that, if adopted, would enhance communication? Have any particular patterns of organization, especially in large, multicampus colleges, shown themselves to be more efficient than others?

3. Does the college have specific administrative provisions (especially budget allocations) to provide faculty adequately with the following?

a. Sabbatical leave, or special leave where indicated

b. Grants-in-aid for advanced study or refresher work

c. Travel and subsistence allowances for attendance at selected meetings or conferences

d. Clerical and other assistance.

4. What is the nature and extent of in-service programs for faculty at the college? Are such programs planned and carried through by joint faculty-administration teams? Is budget provision made for outside consultants or instructors; for occasional released-time of faculty members coordinating these programs? Are the in-service programs adequately buttressed with supporting personnel (secretarial, visual aids where appropriate, etc.)?

5. Does the college have any program of administrative internship, especially to develop from its own ranks those who would eventually have responsible positions as department or division heads?

6. Does the guidance staff of the college have close working relationships with faculty so that, in effect, mutual and continuing education is taking place; so that each group knows the functions and needs of the other?

7. How is teaching evaluated at the college? Are both faculty and administration satisfied with current methods of evaluation? Is evaluation designed primarily for the

improvement of instruction, or is it simply a screening device for tenure and/or merit pay?

8. Does the college have the equivalent of an office of institutional research (perhaps only one person in a small college, several in larger ones), with the function, among others, of persistent inquiry and experiment with means and methods of instruction?

9. Does the college have adequate, clearly organized means of communications with the senior institutions to which its students transfer?

10. Since nearly two-thirds of all junior college students do not transfer, has the college a program of follow-up studies to provide knowledge of what, in fact, its students do — and how they do — after college? (Such knowledge is indispensable: perhaps the single most pragmatic way of judging and measuring the effectiveness of current programs.)

CONCLUDING NOTE

Such was the nature of this project, that its findings and interpretations had to be essentially the work of one person. However, during the nearly fourteen months of interviews, of consultation, and of drafting this report, guidance and counsel were sought from many knowledgeable persons in the field. They are too numerous to list, but their always generous help is gratefully noted. The Project Advisory Committee members were at all times during the year in touch with the progress of the study. They worked carefully with the draft of this report, and their many helpful suggestions and criticisms are embodied in its final form.

In no sense is this report intended or thought to be a definitive statement. It is, rather, the record of an exploration. Its hoped-for use is that it will contribute to a necessary continuing dialogue about the professional issues and problems identified by junior college faculty, and that it might serve as a general guideline to action toward the solution of the problems.